

THE REPUBLIC.

Devoted to the Dissemination of Political Information.

VOL. VII.

WASHINGTON, D. C., OCTOBER, 1876.

No. 4.

HOW HARD TIMES ARE MADE HARDER BY THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The circumstance upon which the Democratic party base their chief hope of success in the present political campaign is unquestionably the hardness of the times. Their expectation is that tens of thousands of Republican voters will desert their party, or at least remain at home on election day, because they find themselves in straitened circumstances. Even the ravages of the grasshopper and the damage to crops by drought in one locality or excessive moisture in another are expected to be traced by some mysterious process to the maladministration, "corruption," or extravagance of the Republican party. It is to the last named fault that Mr. Tilden, in his letter of acceptance, traces the present depressed condition of trade and industry, and it is chiefly by economy in the national expenditures that he proposes to restore the country to a condition of prosperity. Now we believe it to be true that public expenditures are as a whole larger than they ought to be, but it is chiefly in municipal expenditures that this excess exists. In some cases State expenditures may be somewhat extravagant, but those of the National Government have been such as to leave but a slight margin for reduction, and the reductions actually made in the appropriations during the last session of Congress have been chiefly effected by a sacrifice of the public interests, which will suffer incomparably more from this cause than they ever suffered through any slight excess of expenditures which may previously have ex-

isted. The present assessed value of real and personal property in the United States is estimated to be upwards of \$20,000,000,000, and the true value to be about \$43,000,000,000. Taking the assessed value, however, as the basis of calculation, the expenditures of the National Government for the last fiscal year amounted to a tax of less than one and three-tenths per cent. If from the total expenditures (about \$258,000,000) we deduct interest on the public debt (about \$100,000,000) and pensions, (about \$28,000,000,) the expenditures for other purposes will be found equivalent to a tax of only sixty-four hundredths of one per cent., and by deducting other items which, like the two just mentioned, are clearly traceable to the late Democratic rebellion, we should find that the actual expenditures of the Government for current services amount to less than one half of one per cent. on the assessed value of the taxable property of the country. The contrast between these figures and those which are exhibited in the financial reports of the Democratic city of New York is positively startling. We are unable to give the figures for the latest year, but those for 1870—a time when Mr. Tilden was cheek by jowl with Tweed and other ring thieves of that city—show expenditures amounting to no less than four and two-thirds per cent on the total assessed value of the real and personal property subject to taxation. Happily, however, this state of things is quite exceptional; for though our large cities are not, as

a rule, any too well governed, whether under Republican or Democratic rule, New York is the only city which can boast a robber like Tweed, or a reformer like Tilden, whose conversion to virtue and honesty occurred just at the moment to enable him to join in the cry of "Stop thief" when the pursuit of the plunderers began.

The truth is that national taxes are reasonably low and State taxes are not as a general rule extravagant. Particular communities, like the people of New York city, may groan under excessive burdens, but the people at large have no great cause to complain on the score of excessive taxes, and no one knows better than Mr. Tilden the absurdity of attributing to this cause a state of financial distress which had no existence eight or ten years ago, when the taxes collected by the General Government were about twice their present sum and the population and wealth of the country much smaller than they are at present.

The fact is, as Governor Tilden very well knows, if he possesses the intelligence to fit him for the high position to which he aspires, that periods of commercial and industrial distress like that through which we are now passing are due to causes of an exceedingly complex nature, the analysis of which has called forth the best efforts of the ablest statesmen and economists of the age. The financial crises in which such periods originate appear to have little, if any, connection with the political administration of the various countries in which they periodically occur. The last great crisis in our own country previous to that of 1873, from whose effects we are still suffering, occurred in 1857 under the Democratic administration of James Buchanan, but grave as were its faults that administration cannot reasonably be charged with having caused the general suspension of banks which occurred in the year just mentioned or the prolonged prostration of trade and industry by which that suspension was followed. The most thoughtful political economists—men who reach their conclusions through calm reflection, undisturbed by the conflicts of political parties—attribute these unfortunate experiences, through which so many nations are periodically obliged to pass, to the exceedingly complex character of modern industry and

the immense development of the credit system which has grown out of the necessity of concentrating the small loans and investments of the many into the hands of a comparatively small number, to be employed in erecting and operating the great establishments in which modern industry is so largely carried on, or in the execution of the various gigantic enterprises for which the present century has been so signally distinguished.

The process by which a period of general industrial stagnation is reached is well described in the following extract from a very able article on the "Wage-fund Theory," by General Francis A. Walker, which appeared in the *North American Review* for January, 1875. After briefly sketching the industrial conditions which prevail in a primitive state of society, General Walker says:

"If now we take a long step and reach a condition of industrial civilization, we find great numbers producing that which they do not themselves desire to consume, but which they look to others to take off their hands. If we examine the catalogue of articles thus produced we shall find some of them supplying wants the most imperative, others ministering to the lightest fancies; and between these extremes a host of products meeting desires of varying intensity. Suppose now this intricate organization of the producing body to have been carried to its limits by a long-continued period of general prosperity inducing the greatest diversity of production, when a disaster, industrial or financial in its origin, occurs in the community. Is it not evident that those who are producing the most dispensable articles will find consumption greatly checked, if not destroyed? They cannot at once find a new place in the industrial order. They are trained to one thing only; their tools are adapted to that alone. Even though they enjoyed perfect mobility industrially, it would require a long time to reapportion the supply of labor among a diminished number of industries. Hence they suffer, and in their distress have to forego the use of things more necessary to life than those which they had themselves been producing, and this in turn affects the consumption of these articles, and thus distresses new classes of producers, and so the mischief proceeds. Now, were men all perfectly intelligent and self-possessed, the effect would be a constantly diminishing one, as the original loss should be distributed over an ever-widening circle of production. But as men are, panic enters almost at the first; apprehension runs ahead of the evil; consumption is checked

far more rapidly than is necessary; and every blow which production thus encounters is transmitted with effect heightened by the growing alarm.

"All this would be true if the industrial community were wholly composed of direct producers. But the introduction of "middlemen," merchants, master-manufacturers, and bankers serves prodigiously to heighten the effect. The merchant, perceiving the actual falling off in demand, exaggerates it in his orders to the manufacturer. The latter, judging of the demand only through the merchant's orders, and alarmed by what they show, inevitably in his turn exaggerates the evil and reduces his production more than proportionally. The banker, in his turn, fearing for the safety of the merchant and manufacturer in these critical conditions, and resolved not to be himself the victim, curtails his loans and deprives both of the means essential to the conduct of their already embarrassed business. Such, rudely sketched, are the possibilities of disaster, which lie in the separation of production from consumption, through the division of labor in industrial society."

The industrial conditions of the present day are, in truth, comparatively new to the experience of mankind; and the laws which govern banking, the incorporation of business associations, and generally the business relations of the members of the body politic, are as yet but imperfectly adapted to the wants of the age. This lack of adaptation is due, not to willful maladministration or to willfully bad legislation, but to the occult nature of the problems to be dealt with and the want of an adequate acquaintance with the laws upon which the solution of these problems depends.

It may be said, however, with the most perfect truth and fairness that ignorance of these laws has rarely if ever been more conspicuously manifest in any modern legislative body than it was in the Democratic branch of the Forty-fourth Congress during the session which has just closed; and rarely has such ignorance been conjoined with a stubbornness more thoroughly mulish than that which characterized the action of some of the Democratic leaders of that body. If the science of political economy is not yet sufficiently advanced to afford the means of preventing financial crises, there are at least certain obvious ways in which their effects may be alleviated; and, as all the natural

conditions requisite to public prosperity seemed to be present when the Forty-fourth Congress convened, that body might reasonably have been expected to devote its first and most earnest attention to the task of devising some means for the relief of the prevailing distress. Indeed, it is hardly too much to say that this was the very purpose for which that body was elected, thousands of the less intelligent class of voters having entertained a vague notion that a change of political parties would in some mysterious manner bring about a changed condition of affairs throughout the country. Those who entertained such an idea must have discovered by this time how fallacious were their expectations. And yet, as we have already intimated, there was work which might have been done had the House possessed the intelligence and the patriotism to undertake it.

We have mentioned the large development of the credit system in modern society as one of the causes of financial crises. It is one of the peculiarities of the present era that its manufacturing industries are carried on mainly in large establishments; that consequently small amounts of capital cannot, as a rule, be turned to advantageous account by their possessors in any business of their own, but, to become profitable, must be lent to others; and that, as a matter of fact, vast sums in the aggregate are so lent and, in combination, are used in carrying on the great industries of the world.

Now, under a system of industry which depends so largely on tens of thousands of small loans indirectly made through the agency of banks, it is of the utmost importance, nay, it is absolutely vital, to the prosperity of such industry that a feeling of confidence in the safety of this sort of loans shall be diffused throughout the country. Such a feeling of confidence did prevail to a very considerable extent prior to the crisis of 1873; but that event developed the fact that many of the banks which had received these small loans in the form of deposits were unsound; that the managers of these institutions, moved by inordinate greed of gain, had taken the money of depositors and instead of lending it on approved security, as they easily might have done, had invested

it in speculative enterprises. A signal example of such mismanagement is seen in the case of Jay Cooke & Co., who had invested millions of dollars belonging to their depositors in the futile attempt to build a great railroad through the midst of a wilderness. And when such firms failed it was found that depositors were practically without remedy.

Such experience naturally shook the confidence of the people in banking institutions generally, and, by preventing deposits, dried up tens of thousands of small streams of capital which previously had helped to keep the wheels of industry in motion.

Now, one of the greatest of practical problems which a national legislature could have set itself to solve would have been that of restoring these small streams of capital to their usual channels by infusing confidence among the people; and the way to do this was to furnish a solid foundation for such confidence by such an improvement in our banking system as would give to the money of depositors the highest attainable security. The problem is, indeed, a difficult one, but its solution is by no means impossible; and in view of the great value such a measure would have in restoring the country to its normal prosperity it might well have claimed the first place in the deliberations of Congress. Instead of that, we have witnessed a most humiliating spectacle. At a time when wise statesmanship was peculiarly needed we have seen a whole session of Congress—the longest for many years past—almost exclusively devoted to making party capital by the most pitiful arts of the demagogue, while of that statesmanship which by wise measures, undertaken with a single eye to the public good, might, without seeking it, have made party capital enough to last for a generation, we have not had a solitary glimpse.

Even the economy upon which the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives have rested their principal claim to public favor has been mainly of that brilliant description which consists in "saving at the spigot and losing at the bung." Internal revenue districts have been consolidated and the force of collectors and assessors cut down at the risk of losses in collection which will far exceed the few paltry thousands saved in the form of official salaries. Thus the peo-

ple who purchase the products subject to taxation will have to pay taxes which for lack of an adequate force of revenue officers to protect the interests of the Government will go into the pockets of dishonest manufacturers instead of the National Treasury. Navy-yards in which the Government has invested from \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000 would have been left, had the House had its own way, without a dollar for their care and protection. In a thousand details, so small that they will never reach the public eye, the pseudo economy adopted by the House with a single eye to political effect will bear a crop of waste and loss. Thus, in one of the public offices, we recently saw a quantity of valuable reports which had been received from a foreign Government. They consisted chiefly of heavy quarto volumes in paper covers. A requisition had been made for the binding of them, but the reply came that owing to the scantness of the appropriation for such work it would have to be indefinitely deferred. The expense of binding is not *saved* but merely postponed, and the postponement is at the probable cost of serious damage to the books, which must be used in their present form. There is an old saying that for want of a nail the shoe was lost, and for want of a shoe the horse was disabled. The Democratic economists of the House of Representatives have not hesitated in any case to save the nail at the expense of the horse whenever the loss of the latter could be postponed or concealed until after the November election.

One of the most signal examples of this is seen in the postponement of necessary public works, which, owing to the dullness of the times and the consequent cheapness of labor and materials, might have been executed now at about one-third less cost than they would involve at a time when business is good. The postponing of such works is certainly not the kind of economy which is practiced by sagacious private capitalists. Any one who keeps his eyes open as he walks the streets of our capital city, for example, cannot fail to be struck by the large number of buildings in course of erection; and we believe that the same state of things exists in most other cities and rising towns throughout the country. Is this because of

any unusual demand for houses or stores? This question, substantially, was asked a few weeks ago of a gentleman who is engaged in erecting a fine, substantial block of dwellings. His answer was a decided negative. "Why, then, are you building so extensively?" he was asked. "Because I can build so cheaply," was the reply; "and the houses are sure to be wanted by and by."

Now, here is a capitalist who is erecting buildings on the faith of a *prospective* demand for them; and were there not many others like him the condition of the working classes throughout the country would be much worse than it is. In contrast with the foresight and enterprise of such men how wretchedly stupid and imbecile appears the policy which men of the Randall type are impressing upon the National Government! The nation has no need to erect public buildings with a view to a *prospective* necessity for them. The necessity exists already, and, in Washington particularly its existence, on a large scale, is *demonstrated* by the rents the Government is paying for private buildings to accommodate public offices for which there is not room in the Departments to which they belong. In these buildings large amounts of property and public records of the utmost importance are exposed to constant risk of fire, while furniture is subject to breakage, and the public business to interruption and derangement by frequent removals, three of which are commonly said to be as bad as fire itself.

Now, why is it that the buildings necessary for the permanent accommodation of these outlying offices cannot be erected at once? And why is it that we cannot at once erect such buildings as the public service needs in various other cities throughout the country? Why is it that we cannot now continue work on the double-turreted iron-clads whose construction, being deemed necessary to enable us to hold our own, even in a contest with an effete and third-rate power like Spain, was commenced two or three years ago? Why is it that we cannot provide for the necessary repairs to ships of our existing navy, or even for the ordinary care needed to preserve them from decay? Why can we not now, as well as any other time, construct

the fortifications which competent military men deem necessary to the safety of our scattered garrisons, and to the efficiency of our operations against the hostile savages, who have come to understand so well our paltry economies that even our forty odd millions of population no longer have any terrors for them? Why need we postpone such improvements as are really needed in important rivers and harbors, and thus, by subjecting commerce to unnecessary disabilities, add to the cost of imported articles and diminish the price which the producer receives for articles destined for exportation? Are we postponing the work until there is a revival of business? But with a revival of business will come an increased demand for labor and a consequent rise in wages and in commodities. Why, then, should we forego the saving which might be effected by executing these works now? Is it because the people are at present too poor to bear additional taxation? But additional taxation is unnecessary. The credit of the Government is so good that it can now borrow money at about $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum; and, as regards public buildings, at least, it may safely be said that the rents saved by their erection would much more than pay the interest on the sum required to erect them; while the saving in cost which would be effected by executing these and the various other works above named at the present time, instead of postponing them until after the revival of business, would alone be sufficient to make it immensely profitable to borrow every dollar needed for the purpose. There has been no question of borrowing, however, or of adding a dollar to existing taxation. All that has been proposed on the part of the executive department of the Government has been work for the execution of which the existing revenues would probably yield all the money that would be needed. There seems, therefore, to be but one reason why this work must be postponed, and that is the necessity under which the Democratic party finds itself of doing some startling thing by way of demonstrating that it is the party of economy. And the plan it has selected is that of postponing the expenditure of a certain number of millions now with the pro-

spect of having to spend those same millions, with half as many more added, after the revival of business shall have increased the rates of wages and the prices of materials.

Not merely is this wasteful policy unwarranted by the present depression in business; not only does it utterly fail to afford the slightest relief from the pressure of hard times, but, on the contrary, it aggravates existing distress and withholds from thousands of the working classes a relief which would have been as welcome to them as the giving of it would have been profitable to the Government. The total reduction in the appropriation bills of this year, as compared with those for the fiscal year 1875-6, is shown by a careful analysis to be about \$20,000,000, of which about three-fourths consist of postponed appropriations.

These postponed appropriations, for the most part, represent postponed work, and the postponement of work implies the throwing of workmen out of employment, or the failure to employ those to whom employment might have been furnished. Hence it is not merely at a loss to the Government, but at a still graver loss to the working classes, and through them to the trade of the country, that necessary public works have been postponed. The good which might have been done by the judicious employment of the \$15,000,000 unnecessarily and wastefully withheld cannot easily be calculated. At a moderate estimate the expenditure of this sum would have given steady employment for a year to more than twenty thousand mechanics and laborers. These workmen would thus have had the means of purchasing many comforts which they will now be obliged to forego, and their custom would have given employment to other workmen in producing the articles which they would have been enabled to consume. The employment of this second body of workmen would in turn have increased their power as consumers, and thus would have furnished employment for a third body, and so on indefinitely. It is therefore difficult to estimate the aggregate number of persons who could have been furnished with employment by the adoption of a wisely liberal policy in reference to the prosecution of public works;

and this, too, as we have already shown, not merely without loss, but at a great profit to the Government itself, and without imposing any additional burdens upon the people, whose taxes this economical House of Representatives has not reduced by a single penny.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

We have shown that the Democratic outcry against the extravagance of the Federal Government under Republican administration is unfounded.

The total expenditures for the last fiscal year amounted to only one and three-tenths per cent. on the present assessed value of our property, and to not more than six-tenths of one per cent. on its estimated true value.

Deducting interest on the public debt, pensions, and other expenses due to the late Democratic rebellion, from the total expenditures, the expenditures for all other objects amount to less than half of one per cent. on the assessed, and less than one-fourth of one per cent. on the true value of our taxable property.

The expenditures of the Democratic city of New York in 1870, when Tilden and Tweed were still on terms of intimacy, amounted to $4\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. on the assessed value of property in that city.

The assertion that the present depression in business is due to official extravagance is contradicted by the fact that business was comparatively good when the expenditures of the Government were about twice their present amount. It is also at variance with the views of the ablest political economists, who attribute financial crises, and the business prostration which follows them, to the causes already pointed out.

If the assertion were sincerely made it would indicate such ignorance on the part of those who make it as to preclude all hope of their discovering and removing the causes of our financial troubles.

The incompetency of the Democratic party to discover and remove these causes has in fact been abundantly demonstrated by the course of its representatives in Congress during the last session.

Their sole remedy for hard times has been

to cut down the appropriations by which they have—

First. Crippled the Government and exposed it to loss through an imperfect collection of the revenues.

Second. Postponed needed public works, upon which millions of dollars might have been saved by executing them while labor and materials can be had at their present low rates.

Third. Added tens of thousands, directly and indirectly, to the great army of the unemployed, who in some of our cities are already muttering "bread or blood," and withheld from as many more employment which, under an enlightened policy, might have

been furnished with equal advantage to them, to the Government, and to the people at large.

In all of this there has not appeared a spark of patriotic purpose. It is true that much of the mischief done may be attributed to ignorance and stupidity; but the motives of the House were as bad as its intelligence was defective; and if its legislation has been worse than party spirit and unmitigated demagogism need have made it, it is only because the leading Democratic members lacked the wit to see how far they might take care of the public interests without compromising the interests of their party.

THE SITUATION.

That the condition of the country is a critical one even the most cursory observer will admit. The issues of the hour are those of 1860 resurrected under a new name, and thousands more sprung into life during the last sixteen years. And these issues are of such vital importance, appeal so strongly to the *patriotism* of the whole country, not to mere *political bias*, that no man or woman who has the life and welfare of that country at heart can look upon them with the indifference with which many regard the ordinary struggles of one party to dethrone the other every four years. The issues of 1860 are entering largely into the present conflict. They were defeated then by the bullet—they must be overcome now by the ballot. When the rebels laid down their arms in 1865 the loyal people threw away theirs and sprang forward with hands extended to give the clasp of reconciliation and brotherly love. But how were they met? Was the response equally frank and sincere? No! Like whipped schoolboys the Southerners put their hands behind their backs and refused the offered pledge. Still, the North was patient and hopeful. They trusted that when time had healed the wounds and softened the bitterness the South would see what was for their own good and accept the situation. They (the North) were like travelers in a new country met by a terrific storm. After weathering it—after seeing the clouds break

away, the flashes of lightning becoming less and less frequent, the thunder fainter and fainter, and finally the sun shine forth in mid-sky, they fondly hoped all danger past. Because the sun was not obscured they said the elemental strife was over. And when those who were "native here and to the manner born," the loyal people of the South, uttered their words of warning they met a like fate with Cassandra. When they pointed to the low, black shadows lying along the horizon, and the deep red flashes of lightning that occasionally dyed them, and called attention to the distant muttering of the thunder, and cried the storm was but retiring to gather new force—was but gliding around upon the wind and would once more mount to the zenith, and that at no late day, they were laughed at for their fears. But now, after sixteen years, these warnings are proved to have been timely ones; and at the first Presidential election in which all the "reconstructed" Southern States take part the work is all to be done over again if we would not see the country struck down like some monarch of the forest beneath the revived power of the storm. Now, as then, the Southerners are clinging to the false doctrine of State's Rights, only in a new dress. The cry is again that they want "self-government" and "to be let alone." That is all just as it was in 1860—and a very modest request, their apologists told

us. But let us see how the idea is to be carried out in 1876; its working in 1860 is patent to all the world. If we had let them alone eight years ago each State would have had slavery re-established under another name, and the negro, as helpless and degraded as before the war, would to-day have cried as loudly for succor as he did then. But we did not let them alone, and the full rebel element not then having a representation in Congress laws of universal suffrage were passed, which put a weapon of self-protection into the black man's hands. Now they want "to be let alone," that by murder and intimidation they may drive that black man and his friends, the Southern Republicans, from the polls, and so obtain that "self-government" of rebels, by rebels, and for rebels for which their souls sigh. And this enfranchised negro is one of the issues which has sprung into life since 1860. The Republican party is responsible for him and to him, and can no more, in honor and honesty, throw him over than they can ignore the national debt.

The geni has escaped from the bottle, which was his prison, and will not redissolve into a mist and return to it to be again corked up and put out of the way. But the geni of the Arabian Nights rewarded, if memory serves, his liberator by valuable presents, and so will the negro, if properly cared for and protected until he can fully protect himself, reward his liberators by helping them to preserve the gift of liberty to the whole country. That the issues of 1860 are revived it is only necessary to read the accounts which reach us constantly from one or other of the reconstructed States that are clamoring for "self-government." Only the other day Wade Hampton, one of the fiercest and most uncompromising rebels—one whose slogan during the war was, "*We have no time to take prisoners,*" and accordingly whose hands are deeper dyed with Northern blood than almost any other of their leaders—Wade Hampton is unanimously nominated for Governor of South Carolina. Why? Because with a wise prudence he tries to induce the people to forget the past, so far as to bear no malice, but to unite with the other States to meet the North half way in its offers of peace?

Because he endeavors to soothe the passions and curb the fierce spirits of those who look upon him as a leader? By no means! But for the very reverse. Because he never loses an opportunity of exciting those very passions, of lashing those fierce spirits into greater fury, of bringing the lost cause forward on all occasions, and waving the palmetto flag before them whenever opportunity offers; because he sneers at the negro and insults him, and vows he shall have no rights now any more than he had in the past, if he can prevent it. For such qualities, and such only, is Wade Hampton unanimously nominated by the rebel Democracy of South Carolina to be their Governor. At this Tilden and Hendricks meeting, after the nomination of Wade Hampton, several ex-generals and colonels of the rebel army spoke. Mr. (General?) Sam Ferguson told them how, with a Republican majority of five thousand in Mississippi, the election of the rebel officials was carried by a Democratic majority of eleven hundred. There was no intimidation or violence, according to this gentleman—"but we told the Radical leaders that if one drop of blood was shed not one of them should leave the State alive"—and so "all went merry as a marriage bell." Mr. (General?) Gary advised the people not to hurt the poor, ignorant negro, but to hang the white Republican leaders first, the mulattoes second, and then the black ones, and he believed the American Congress would pass them a vote of thanks! Butler, of Hamburg, explained his little game to them in plain language. And all this was done in a grand ratification meeting in the Columbia State-house yard, not by a few reckless, insignificant men, but by the leaders of the Democracy in the "prostrate State" of South Carolina. And yet there are men like Mr. Lamar who claim for the South full renunciation of the principles leading to the war, and acceptance of those developed by it, and expect the country to believe them! He (Lamar) supposes the world will close its ears to the cries which come up from the victims of these men who are leagued together to carry their murderous policy out at all hazards, and force each State under rebel rule by bloodshed, if no other means will attain their end,

and listen only to the rounded periods in which he dresses his falsehoods as he stands upon the floor of the nation's Congress, under the folds of the very flag he used every effort to destroy, and now insults by his very presence! But if the evil of negro suffrage was a necessity forced upon the Republican party, that of rebel enfranchisement was as grievous a mistake. To that mistaken policy of kindness the evils of the present day are all owing. Had the right to vote been withheld from every man who bore arms in, or aided and abetted the rebellion in any way, the Democratic party would have died a natural death, and from its ashes a better and a wiser one would have arisen. But the evil once done, the object of all loyal men must be to prevent its full effects from destroying the country by defeating them next November in the Presidential contest. The people must not be led astray by the catch words "reform and retrenchment" with which the friends of the rebels are trying to beguile them. They must look back upon the record of the Republicans for the last sixteen years with calm, dispassionate judgment, and giving all due heed to the errors of that party, forget not the good work it has done. When the Democratic rebellion broke upon the country the Republican party sprang, like Minerva from the head of Jove full armed, at once to life and the fulness power. For four years it guided the ship of State through the sea of blood and brought her safe to anchor at a peaceful port. If it made mistakes it hastened to correct them. That the people indorsed its actions the elections of '64, '68, and '72 have proved. Is it reserved for the Centennial year of our national life to see all that indorsement canceled, all the work of the sixteen years undone, and the country a prey to the very men whose efforts, had they succeeded, would have rendered it in this year of 1876 a by-word and a mockery for the nations?

Another issue of the war which the Republican party is bound to the country to guard is the national debt. Power once put into the hands of the rebels and their Democratic confederates, and that debt will be repudiated and the liabilities of the South met instead. The many rebel personal claims with which they have clogged the wheels of the last session

of Congress would be a mere bagatelle compared to the millions that would be put into the pockets of the rebels under that head, and the nation would be bankrupt in a year. That the country was not wrecked through the machinations of the party which now asks the people to restore it to power is due to the Republican party; that that party made mistakes no one will deny, (and there was no greater mistake than giving the rebels the right to vote;) that wicked and dishonest men cloaked themselves under its name in order to further their own designs no one will deny; neither will they deny that they were ejected from their places as soon as their villainy was discovered, and promptly punished for their crimes by that very party. "To err is human," and the Republican party is composed of men not supernatural beings, consequently as men, they are as apt as any others to err, particularly when they give up the beacon-lights of that party's principles, and while still calling themselves by its name go aside after personal aggrandisement. But the principles of the party will last as long as the world will last, because they are founded upon the rock of right and justice, and even should the people be led astray by the *ignis fatuus* of Democratic promises to desert those principles, they will hasten at the first opportunity to retrieve their mistake and resume their allegiance to them. Democracy has been galvanized into life by the misplaced clemency of over-sanguine Republicans, but there is no soul in it and it cannot thrive.

"Truth crushed to the earth will rise again,
The eternal years of God are hers;
But error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers."

A MERE "reduction" of the appropriations of the Government service does not always mean a "saving." While the appropriation bills of this year, as passed by the House of Representatives, are in the aggregate \$29,594,187.38 less than for the same branches of the service last year, the actual "saving" to the Treasury, as is conclusively shown by Senator Windom in his speech in the United States Senate August 12th, is *not one-fifth of that sum*. Senator Windom's figures are official, and they are conclusive on that point.

WHERE THE CREDIT BELONGS.

One of the many weak inventions of the enemy in the present political contest is the statement that Governor Tilden has reduced taxation in the State of New York to the extent of eight millions of dollars, and is therefore entitled to the reputation of being a great political reformer, and to the management of the affairs of the National Government. The claim that he is a great reformer is not true in point of fact, and even if it were true it does not follow that he is entitled to the Presidency in preference to Governor Hayes, whose character, record, and views will bear the closest scrutiny without detracting in the least from his fair fame. A reduction of about seven and a half millions of dollars in the State taxes of New York has been made, if we go back to 1874 for a comparison. The reduction from 1875 is considerably smaller. But we shall presently see by whom these reductions were made, and that Governor Tilden is not entitled to the credit. Several weeks ago he issued a campaign document in the shape of a veto, in which he instituted a false and misleading comparison between the State taxes of 1876 and those of 1874, the last year of Governor Dix's administration. Whether intentionally or not, in this manifesto he confuses expenditures with taxes. Out of \$7,459,286, the computed reduction of taxes, he claims \$6,323,417, as the result of "real economies" in expenditures, and craftily insinuates that the whole \$6,323,417 of these so-called savings were effected through his agency and influence. How preposterous this claim is, upon which his reputation as a great reformer is principally based, will appear as we proceed. In fact, the falsity of his pretenses in this respect has been exposed time and again, but by systematic and judicious advertising his bulletins grew and his fictitious fame spread abroad like his own ambition. We even find that in the Senate of the United States a Democratic Senator from Delaware, Mr. Saulsbury, recently declared that there was a cry for reform from all parts of the country, and that his party had presented to the country a man who had reduced the taxes in his own State from \$15,-

000,000 to \$8,000,000. He also said that "the Democrats would hail with joy the day when the Government at Washington would be reformed and purified by the man who had purified the government of New York." A Democratic Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Eaton, in a very partisan speech, said still more recently on the floor of the Senate, that "the taxation of the State of New York before the accession of Mr. Tilden to power was \$16,000,000 annually, and that after his accession to power it was \$8,000,000." He then concluded that "there must be a change here such as there was in New York, where, instead of \$16,000,000 a year, the taxation was reduced to \$3,000,000 a year." His figures and statements, like those of Mr. Saulsbury, were even more exaggerated than those of Mr. Tilden. At the Democratic ratification meeting in Boston Judge Abbott called Governor Tilden, amidst great applause, "a man who has proved by his acts that he is capable in a year and a half of reducing the burden of taxes in the great Empire State of New York nearly one-half." The claims made on Mr. Tilden's behalf can be properly characterized only by the use of very unparliamentary language, or else it must in charity be said that these Senators, this Judge, and their political friends generally, have shown great weakness in taking the Governor at his own word. They are too innocent to suspect or too partisan to admit that Governor Tilden, in order to advance his personal political fortunes, is guilty of claiming for himself a reputation for reform which does not belong to him. Without attempting to reconcile this fact with his character as a candid man, we shall content ourselves with briefly stating the following facts, showing on what an unsubstantial basis rests his reputation as a financial reformer in his own State, upon which he and his supporters greatly rely in advancing his claims for election to the Presidency:

The Legislature of New York, and not the Governor, originates all appropriations and tax bills. The Legislature elected last November, and still existing, consists of 20 Republicans and 12 Democrats in the Senate,

and 72 Republicans and 56 Democrats in the House, and is therefore a Republican Legislature. This Legislature passed this year every one of the tax laws and made all the appropriations. The Governor's vetoes this year were few and insignificant, notwithstanding his great desire to make political capital by the exercise of the veto power. Whatever credit is due for the reduction of taxes this year as compared with those of any former year is therefore due to the Republican Legislature, and not to Governor Tilden. The sum levied in 1874, while General Dix was Governor, for the payment of debts and for the sinking funds, was nearly \$6,000,000, which was made necessary for deficiencies in the sinking funds, several millions of money having been diverted therefrom in consequence of low taxes and profuse expenditures under preceding Democratic administrations. These \$6,000,000 were not for a dollar of expenses, but for extinguishing debt and for the sinking funds. The tax levied for 1876 for the same purposes is nearly \$800,000. The difference of more than \$5,000,000 is due to the extinction of the debt and to the filling up of the sinking funds, and not at all, as Governor Tilden claims, to the reduction of expenses, or what he calls "real economies." This year's taxes are undoubtedly less, but it is not because Governor Tilden has reduced expenses, but because debts have been paid. The provision for the payment of these debts and for the relief of the tax-payers, for which Governor Tilden unjustly wishes to take the credit, is due to the Republican administration of Governor Dix, who restored \$11,000,000 to the sinking funds, from which they had been taken by the Democratic party to help out the State payments. The sinking funds were thus made complete. The whole indebtedness of the State was reduced during Governor Dix's term more than \$8,000,000. The process of extinguishing the bounty debt of \$21,000,000, owing to the large premium upon sinking fund investments made by the Republicans, was in a more advanced condition when Governor Tilden came into office than Governor Dix had anticipated it would be. Last year's tax rate, by being levied on an assessed valuation

much increased over that which was taken as the dividend in computing the rate, produced over a million dollars more than the State required or could lawfully use, and this million is now being used for current appropriations in place of a million dollars which otherwise must have been obtained this year by higher taxes. In 1874 the Legislature and Governor Dix, instead of being favored in this way, were compelled to tax the people for a deficiency in the general fund, which had been created by Democratic management of the State finances. The reduction of taxation, which is due to Governor Dix's interference on behalf of the sinking funds, and to the paying off of debts, is now claimed by Governor Tilden and his supporters to be due to greater economy of administration. In his false and misleading comparison in the message referred to Governor Tilden attempts to rob a Republican of the reputation which is justly due to him, in order to bolster up his own and convey the impression to the people that he has reduced the expenses of the State government by \$6,000,000, and is therefore a great reformer and peculiarly qualified as a Democratic candidate for the office of President of the United States. The reduction of taxes to the extent of \$6,000,000, which Governor Tilden claims is due to his efforts, has been exaggerated by Democratic Senators and newspapers to \$8,000,000. The false pretenses which Governor Tilden put forth in order to promote his nomination and election to the Presidency prove conclusively, if they prove anything, that he is one of the most stupendous of those shams which he says "the public mind will no longer accept."

OVER fifty million dollars of the annual public expenditures of the Government, for pensions, &c., are the direct result of the Democratic rebellion. This sum is annually taken from the pockets of the people. That same Democracy now wants to control the Government, in order to vote payment for rebel claims.

PROTECTION against undue foreign industrial competition is as clearly one of the first laws of civilized nations as self-preservation is a law of nature itself.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS—WHY THE REPEAL OF THE LAW WAS WANTED.

The movement of the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives for the repeal of the election laws in relation to the registration of voters and the appointment of supervisors of elections was, like much of their legislation, purely a partisan measure. Its political object was to open the door to the old system of frauds that prevailed in elections throughout the Nation, and particularly in the State of New York in 1868, and thus to secure a "solid South" for the Democracy in the pending Presidential contest without any interference on the part of the General Government. It is well known that the grossest frauds prevailed in the elections held in the State of New York in 1868, especially in the city of New York, where Tweed and Tilden, backed by the Tammany Democracy, exercised a powerful influence. Subsequent investigations have shown that these frauds were sanctioned and indorsed by the prominent Democrats of that State, one of whom is now the Presidential candidate of the Democratic party, and who was at that time chairman of the Democratic State Committee. In his capacity of chairman of said committee, Samuel J. Tilden issued a private and strictly confidential circular addressed to his partisan friends throughout the State, in which he urged them "at once to communicate with some reliable person in three or four principal towns, and in each city of the county," requesting him ("expenses duly arranged for at this end) to telegraph to Wm. M. Tweed, Tammany Hall, at the minute of closing the polls, not waiting for the count, such person's estimate of the vote." Specific directions were then given as to the form of the telegram. He then added, and the language is especially significant: "There is, of course, an important object to be attained by a simultaneous transmission at the hour of closing the polls, but not longer waiting." This language is certainly explicit. Waiting longer than the hour of closing the polls would defeat the important object to be attained by a simultaneous transmission. Further directions were given with the view of obtaining a

simultaneous transmission at the hour of closing the polls. The estimates were to be telegraphed to Tweed at the minute of closing the polls, without waiting for the count. And this private and strictly confidential circular, by which an important object to the Democracy was to be obtained by a simultaneous transmission at the hour of closing the polls, and lost by waiting longer, was signed by Samuel J. Tilden, Chairman of the Democratic State Committee.

In 1869, when the full extent of the election frauds committed by the Democracy in 1868 became fully known, Horace Greeley, who only four years ago was the candidate of the same party for President of the United States, addressed an open letter in the *New York Tribune* of October 20 to Samuel J. Tilden, the present candidate of the same party, in which he accused him of wholesale ballot-box stuffing, and went on to say: "On the principle that the receiver is as bad as the thief, you are as deeply implicated in this matter to-day as though your name were Tweed, O'Brien, or Oakey Hall." Coming from the Democratic candidate in 1872, this declaration ought to have some weight in determining the character of the Democratic candidate in 1875. As Mr. Greeley said, "the manifest intent of this circular was to 'make assurance doubly sure' that the frauds here (in New York city) perpetrated should not be overborne by the honest vote of the rural districts." Mr. Greeley pointed out some of the glaring frauds in the lower wards of the city, and then added: "Mr. Tilden, you know what this contrast attests. Right well do you comprehend the means whereby the vote of 1868 was thus swelled out of all proportions."

The head and front of this gigantic swindle, by which over fifty thousand fraudulent votes were cast and counted in New York city, was William M. Tweed, and in this corrupt scheme he had the influence and aid of Samuel J. Tilden, the chairman of the Democratic State committee. In 1868, at the height of his corrupt power, Tweed could

command all the votes required to balance the honest vote of the State. His plan, as Tilden's strictly confidential circular shows, was to get the news in advance from the State, in order to determine, as nearly as possible, how large a vote was needed from the city to counteract the country vote. Thus, by practicing the grossest frauds, the Democrats carried the State of New York in the Presidential election of 1868, and "counted in" Hoffman as Governor.

These irregularities and frauds, so far as they related to the election for representatives to Congress and electors of President and Vice President, were made the subject of a thorough investigation by a Congressional committee, the report of which was submitted to the House on February 23, 1869, by Mr. Lawrence, of Ohio. Investigation revealed a system of Democratic corruption almost beyond belief. In compliance with Mr. Tilden's confidential request over two hundred telegrams were received and paid for by Tammany Hall; and, as the responses came early in the evening, Tweed & Co. were enabled to supply the necessary vote from the city to counterbalance the country vote and thus carry the State for Hoffman. On Tilden's examination as a witness in the Tweed trial the fact

was developed that he had taken \$5,000 from Tweed as a political contribution. It is said that he received \$15,000, but the proof is positive and admitted that he did receive \$5,000. Thus, out of his own mouth, the fact is established that Mr. Tilden was supplied with funds by Mr. Tweed shortly before the confidential circular was agreed upon and issued. It was therefore truly said that expenses were "duly arranged at this end."

And to-day the Democratic chairman of 1868 for the State of New York is the "Reform" candidate for the Presidency of the United States. This is the "honest" man, this is the "reformer" who, in 1868, could have "expenses duly arranged at this end," and for whom the Democrats of the present House of Representatives have thought it necessary to repeal the supervisory election law, in order that unlimited frauds may prevail at the coming elections, and this "honest" man, this Democratic "Reform" candidate for President, be "counted in," as Hoffman, the Democratic candidate for Governor of New York in 1868, was "counted in." This Democratic "reformer" is in urgent need of reform himself, and the party that supports him, knowing his unclean record, is in still more urgent need of reform.

MR. TILDEN'S "PATRIOTISM ABOVE DOLLARS AND CENTS."

The Democratic party is still composed of the men who hug the old delusions, and who are utterly incapable of realizing that the country has outgrown the restraints of its evil policy and repudiated its control. The stronghold of the Democratic party has always been its belief in the ignorance of the masses. And it has entered upon the work of the Presidential campaign by resorting to its stale tricks of bold assertion of downright, absolute falsehood.

Mr. Tilden himself knows that he has not the faintest claim to be considered a reformer. He is one of that very old school of Democrats who have survived to the Centennial year. He never had a thought in advance of the Democratic party. He commenced his political youth in finding out the

party ruts, and he has been all his life running in those ruts, through pools of corruption and chicanery, until he has reached the office of Governor of New York. But it has been said that if before taking the oath of office he had been required to take an oath that he had not been "counted in," he might have hesitated briefly while he asked himself some questions. At all events, as he looks down the tortuous path through which he had traveled, his long and early connection with Tammany, his offensive and unpatriotic conduct during the war for the Union, and his close intimacy with Tweed till he supplanted him, let him say when it was he first yearned for reform, and what he has done for the good of the country.

When Mr. Tilden placed himself in the

hands of the "claqueurs" of the Democratic party as a Presidential aspirant he thought the people would forget his political career. He should know that a Copperhead always puts himself upon record in such a manner that his subsequent deeds must needs be challenged. Mr. Tilden and patriotism were never related; and even Mr. Hewitt's impudent contradiction of Mr. Kasson in the House of Representatives will not serve his purpose. Mr. Tilden never contributed one cent towards the Tammany regiment. The expenses of the regiment were defrayed from the funds of the Union Defense Committee. Mr. Kasson was right, therefore, in the assertion. It was hardly possible for Mr. Kasson to be wrong in saying that Mr. Tilden never said a word and never performed an act that showed he was in sympathy with the Union cause; while it was notorious that his sympathies were all the other way.

Mr. Hewitt's disdain must have been something magnificent as he piped out in reply to the inquiry how much Mr. Tilden gave to the regiment—"patriotism is above dollars and cents!" When the Democratic party went into the rebellion of the South Mr. Tilden clung to its skirts in the North, and roared out lustily that the war was an outrage. How much money would such a man give to equip soldiers to go to the front? Not much, Mr. Hewitt. Mr. Tilden knows he gave nothing—simply nothing. And the people know that Mr. Tilden deserves nothing at their hands, and will get it.

Mr. Tilden and the Democratic party are behind the age. When steam printing and the telegraph came into use the party began to decay. Slavery was doomed directly the electric wire touched Southern soil. For it was not possible that the doings of the Slave Power could be flashed through the world without awakening a response that must destroy it root and branch. But Mr. Tilden was at the Northern end of the wire and avoided being shocked by crying that it was an outrage to send the grand armies of the Republic to put down the rebellion. And Mr. Tilden's Democratic rebel friends thought that he had sufficient occupation thus to lift up his voice and cry out in their favor. But they did not understand Mr. Tilden—Mr.

Samuel J. Tilden—who had a little business of his own to attend to in Michigan. It will be remembered that the gold and silver of the country disappeared shortly after the war commenced; and the greenback was necessary to carry on the war. Then national banks were established, in the hope of assisting the Government, whose circulation was made safe by the deposit of bonds. Perhaps Mr. Tilden did not like to invest in United States bonds. Perhaps Mr. Tilden thought a bank tax unjust, and he did not like to pay it. But he did this: He said he was "a hard money man;" that the Government had no right to promise to pay and not keep its promise; it was dishonest. "Gold and silver for me," said Mr. Tilden, "they are the birds that sing all the year round."

No doubt Mr. Tilden heard those birds sing. No doubt he often talked of "the purchasing power of the greenback and the purchasing power of the gold dollar." "Yes, gentlemen, I am a hard money man," said Mr. Tilden. Then Mr. Tilden hied him to North Michigan, where there were iron and copper industries, and many workmen with large families. There he had mills—iron-mills—and money mills, out of which he turned out paper dollars till he flooded North Michigan and was detected, and he ought to have paid the penalty, but he didn't. So Mr. Tilden, the hard money man in New York, was the softest of soft money men in Michigan, and made much money thereby—"A barr'l of money," as they say in Indiana. And Mr. Tilden is a reformer and a Democrat, and wants to be made President of the United States. Yet more: From being a money maker in Michigan, the history of Mr. Tilden reveals that he was a money taker from the Union Pacific Railroad Company. And between the two he ought to be wealthy, and undoubtedly is. But what honest connection Mr. Tilden could have with the funds of the Union Pacific is a mystery. Mr. Tilden did not tell the story. The books of the railroad told the tale; and this is how the tale is told: Mr. Tilden is connected with the fatal credit mobillier business. A dispatch from this city alleges that the books of the Union Pacific Railroad Company con-

tain the record of the payment in one check of \$25,000 to the Democratic presidential candidate shortly after the credit mobillier transactions, and his receipt also for that amount. It claims, furthermore, for reasons given, that this payment cannot be accounted for as legal fees. Mr. Tilden can possibly explain the matter satisfactorily.

And Mr. Tilden has no right to go back to those days when his patriotism was so great that he called the war an outrage, and plead, as Mr. Hewitt did, that such patriotism was above dollars and cents. Mr. Tilden had \$25,000 of the railroad money in his pocket. Did he earn it? How? Mr. Tilden is not above an answer.

A THOUSAND MILLION DOLLARS WANTED.

An act "To facilitate the adjustment and settlement of claims of citizens of the United States for stores and supplies taken or furnished during the rebellion, for the use of the army of the United States, and for other purposes."

This bill, introduced in Congress by Wilshire, of Arkansas, just before the adjournment, has a significance not comprehended by the casual reader or thinker. The purpose, however, is direct, and it is a matter of surprise that any Democratic member of the House at this time could have been persuaded into embodying in a proposition intended to become a law a scope of possibilities so disastrous and ruinous to the country.

The first section of the bill amounts to this, that all citizens having any such claims, including the loss of vessels and cargoes, the emancipation of slaves, injury to property; commercial inconveniences, and every species of damage resulting directly or indirectly from invasion by a victorious army, whether for actual maintenance or for incidental application of personal effects, may substitute suit against the Government in the District Court of the United States for the district where the losses were incurred, and courts are required to hear cases, whatever may be the sum involved.

Another section makes it the duty of the United States District Attorney to represent the Government in each district, and when he is absent, or the functions of his office are suspended, the United States marshal is to serve a valid writ or process, by pasting a copy on the door of the United States courthouse, and this shall be held sufficient to authorize a trial in all cases.

It goes on further to state that "fees are to be paid to attorneys, marshals, and clerks, according to the amount recorded, or to be

recorded by the plaintiff." And then an important item comes in clearly expressed:

"In all cases of final judgment the sum awarded shall be paid out of any general appropriation made by the Government, upon presentation of the judgment to the Secretary of the Treasury, with interest at five per cent. from date of rendition of judgment."

To clear away every obstacle in this contemplated wholesale raid upon the Treasury, it is proposed that "the laws passed to protect the Treasury in 1871, 1872, and 1873, together with the Commission of Claims, are repealed, and all books, records, or papers filed with the Commission of Claims are to be deposited with the Department of Justice, and to be delivered over to the District courts where cases are brought for claims."

This is comprehensive enough for the most skeptical. It is, in fact, the most sweeping of all Southern attempts yet inaugurated for depleting the Treasury of the United States. It is a measure to reward Southern rebels for their fruitless endeavors to destroy the Republic. Through its cunningly worded provisions the Southern traitors are to be fully and amply reimbursed for all damages incident to the war; and every advantage is given the claimant, and the bill is put forth mainly in the interests of Southern autocrats, whose property was lost in the vain effort to establish a slave oligarchy upon the ruins of the Union.

These suits are "to be heard in the districts where the losses are incurred." This is a master stroke of policy. It means the trial shall be in the South; the witnesses from the immediate neighborhood; the judges doubtless slightly biased through ambition to cultivate popularity among their constituents, and the whole proceedings under the

direct influence of similar grievances to be redressed.

Should Samuel J. Tilden, through any means of political trickery, in which he is a consummate master, succeed in his election to the Presidency, it would probably involve the Congressional districts, carrying them for the Democracy, and the State Legislatures going with the same would secure the Senate, when the machinery of the Government would be wholly in their hands. Under such a state of public affairs Mr. Wilshire's bill would speedily become a law, the courts would be largely, if not absolutely, under control of the Administration, and the rush upon the Treasury would begin.

The amount it would take to satisfy this demand can scarcely be realized. Careful and able men, whose positions have given them the knowledge upon which to base a tolerably correct estimate, think the sum would not fall short of *one thousand million dollars*.

Every clause in this bill is intended to make the collection of these claims an easy matter, while not one safeguard is thrown around the Treasury. No question is asked relative to the claimant's loyal status during the rebellion. The Union and Confederate soldiers are forced upon an equal footing, notwithstanding the former gave all—home,

friends, property, yea, life itself—to save the country, while the latter sustained their losses in the mad effort to destroy it. Under this bill of the astute Mr. Wilshire the contrast is amply sufficient in that while there is no adequate redress for Union soldiers in their great sacrifices the rebels are to be paid even to the uttermost farthing.

The claims from Southern sources already before the Commissioners amounts to something over one hundred million dollars. These claims for damages, in most part fraudulent, have been refused under Republican rule; but let this bill become a law, and the one hundred millions will not only quickly be paid, but swelled in proportions to a thousand millions—nearly, if not quite, half the present national debt.

Are the American people prepared for a crisis of this character? Are the old veteran heroes of the war to be satisfied with this misapplication of their services? Are they willing to step out from beneath the banner of victory, and placing themselves side by side with those whom they conquered, say, we ask nothing, not even considerate remembrance, for our sufferings in preserving the Union, and are willing you should be paid dollar for dollar for every wrong or injury we may have inflicted in thus sustaining the integrity and unity of the Republic?

ENFORCEMENT OF THE ELECTION LAWS.

Mr. Scott Lord, of New York, is a Democrat, but is said to be a Christian. As a believer in Divine truth the golden rule had a home in his heart; and the profligate injustice of his party in the South, by denying the rights of citizenship to the colored people, could no more secure his approval than the solemn work of the statesman could be appreciated by a man of the calibre of Mr. Cox, the servant of Tammany Hall, who believes that the chief object in life is to be a buffoon, and to play antics in the face of Heaven when the angels weep to hear his jokes on the horrors of Andersonville and the murders at Hamburg, in South Carolina. Mr. Lord believed the reports of the massacres of voters at the South to prevent their voting

the Republican ticket. He believed that there were Ku-Klux ruffians and White League assassins whose work was in the interest of the Democratic party. And he arose above the trammels of his party and introduced his preamble and resolution in good faith, that the voice of the South might be heard in the election next November, and the polls be kept open for the deposit of ballots.

The Democratic party is furious at the passage of the resolution. Southern Democrats had arranged that the vote of the South should be solid for their party; and every one knows what that means. So vile a conspiracy against the rights of the citizen is worthy of the dark ages. And as the reports of murders and other political crimes in the

South reached European countries, when the people were filled with indignation against the Turkish massacres of unoffending Christians, it is not to be wondered at that a comparison was drawn between the events at Hamburg, South Carolina, and Limestone, Texas, and the events on the Turkish battlefields. The London *Times* could see no difference between the political assassinations by Democrats in the South and the barbarities of the Bashi Bazuks in the Servian villages; and the American people suffer in reputation abroad, as well as materially and morally at home.

The determination of the President to preserve order in the South during the coming campaign is welcomed by all good citizens; and the orders issued, and to be issued to that end, will undoubtedly be carried out. The use of the army in States lately in rebellion where the habit of disloyalty prevails among the Democratic white citizens, the surviving rebels, is eminently constitutional. If the war had just closed, and these gentlemen, uncertain of the fate which awaited them, had taken the same pains to show their hands as they have done since, it is possible that even the generosity of the Republican party might have considered what was due to the rebel chiefs taken with arms in their hands and bitterness in their hearts before deciding upon the gentle terms of amnesty. And the result might have been different. Treason made odious and dangerous to the necks of the guilty would have had no disposition to erect monuments to the memory of men executed at the stern demand of justice. And the elevation of a few of the most guilty dangling from the limb of a tree might have deprived the world of the pleasure of listening to the voice of Jeff. Davis thanking his rebel comrades for their efforts to destroy the Union, or Congress of the delightful eloquence of Maxey and Gordon or of Lamar and Young, as they defied the patriotism of the people and reveled in reminiscences of their rebellion. It might even have narrowed down the numbers of rebels aspiring to represent the nation or the State in high places, so that when such men as Wade Hampton were looked for they could not be found.

14R

But the mistaken clemency of the Republican party has not been without its lessons, although it has cost thousands of lives, every one of them political murders by the Democratic party in the South. Now, the nation cries, Halt! and the gun-shot policy of the Southern Democracy must cease. The President was never more in earnest than he is to day. His determination to use all constitutional means to put down political assassination, and have the polls kept open, is not to be trifled with. Nor is the temper of the North to be trifled with. The election in the South must be as safe and as free for Republican citizens, white or black, as in the States of Vermont or Massachusetts. Let the Southern Democracy take a note of this. It may be for their benefit, if not for their comfort. And to show how thoroughly the work of protection is to be done, and how busy the proper officers are in making preparation for it, the following information is made public as to carrying out the election laws:

The Attorney General is preparing, and will in a few days issue, specific instructions to United States marshals in every State in the Union, instructing them as to their duties and rights under the election laws. The object of the administration, as stated by the Attorney General, is to secure to every citizen, in Massachusetts as well as in South Carolina, his full rights under the law. The marshals having once been instructed as to their rights under the law will be expected to enforce them; and if they cannot do this with the usual force at their command, then the military will be sent to assist them.

Under the order issued to General Sherman there will be no present change in the stations of troops in any of the States, North or South, but the order itself will be issued in the form of a general order, and sent to all officers commanding divisions, departments, and posts, and they will regard it as a sufficient notice to hold their troops in readiness to answer any legal demand that may be made upon them to assist in executing the law. General Sherman, in speaking of this order, says he does not believe it is the intention of the President to interfere unduly in the affairs of any State, but thinks that the President has determined, as far as lies in his power, there shall be a fair and peaceable election in every State in the Union, even if all the available force of the army must be used to protect citizens in their rights.

ADOPTED CITIZENS—THE TRUTH OF HISTORY.

"Reform is necessary to correct the omissions of a Republican Congress and the errors of our treaties and our diplomacy, which have stripped our fellow-citizens of foreign birth and kindred race, recrossing the Atlantic, from the shield of American citizenship." * * * "We denounce the policy which thus discards the liberty-loving German."—*Democratic Platform*.

Of all the "shams" of the Democratic platform the above quotation contains the most deliberate perversion of truth. It is unworthy even of the hypocrisy of Tilden. For nearly half a century the Democratic party has impudently assumed the exclusive friendship of adopted citizens, when in fact Democrats have only made them "hewers of wood and drawers of water." Democratic administrations, in their treaties, have utterly pretermitted the rights of naturalized citizens when "recrossing the Atlantic." This is absolutely affirmed, and the treaties are appealed to for its confirmation. In truth the only treaties embracing this subject have been negotiated by Republicans. Numerous treaties are signed by Van Buren, Marcy, Buchanan, and other Democratic lights, but not one provides guarantees for "our fellow-citizens of foreign birth" on "recrossing the Atlantic." And not only so, but the lower House of the present Congress is Democratic; what has it done to correct the "errors" complained of? Has any bill or measure been introduced or proposed? Not one. But the subject was investigated by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and a unanimous report made by Mr. Faulkner, its Democratic chairman; which report not only compliments and vindicates the present treaty, (1868,) but declares it to have been carried out by the German Government "with scrupulous honor and good faith." "This treaty," says the report, "gives to the naturalized citizen" * * * "a guarantee from both Governments that his rights shall be fully recognized and protected." What becomes of the Democratic platform? What must be the character of the men who concocted it? In the following pages the Democracy is "stripped" of the assumption in which it has concealed itself,

when it will appear, for "lo, these many years," to have been only an "ass" in a "lion's skin."

The attitude of the Democrats toward naturalized citizens is only equalled by the conduct of Codlin, in Dickens's story of the Old Curiosity Shop. After persecuting little Nell for a long time some circumstances led him to think that something could be made by being on good terms with her. In an instant he turned and shouted, "Codlin's your friend; Codlin's your friend, not Short!"

Our Democratic Codlins, with few interruptions, were in power from the opening of the century until the beginning of the rebellion. During that time they practically controlled every department of the Government. They had the Presidency, the Cabinet, Congress, the Supreme Court—everything. What did they do for the emigrant? And what has been done by their opponents?

I.—AS TO NATURALIZATION.

In the First Congress of the United States the States' rights Democrats were in a great minority. The first statute for regulating naturalization was enacted by that Congress in 1790. It provided that the alien, being a free white person who should have resided within the United States for the term of *two* years, might become a citizen on complying with the provisions of the statute.

In 1795 the Democrats had a majority in the House of Representatives. They repealed the act of 1790, and substituted a statute requiring a residence of *five* years in the United States, and a preliminary declaration of intention to become a citizen, to be made *three* years, at least, before the naturalization. Under this statute, however, they allowed the fact of the five years' residence to be proved by the oath of the emigrant himself.

In 1793, under the pressure of a war with France, the period of residence required as a preliminary to naturalization was greatly extended, but the statute was in great measure suspended by provisions permitting

persons who had previously declared their intention to become citizens to become so at any time within four years after the passage of the act, and the act itself was repealed before the expiration of the four years.

In 1802 the States' rights party obtained the entire control of the Government. They repealed the previous acts, and enacted a new statute containing similar provisions as to time as were contained in the act of 1795, but they required the emigrant to prove his five years' residence by other testimony than his own affidavit. The practical effect of this statute was to throw an additional impediment in the way of naturalization. It is still in force, except as hereinafter mentioned.

In 1824 the States' rights Democrats had lost their control of the House. The Congress which elected John Quincy Adams as President modified the act of 1802 by reducing the period for making the preliminary declaration of intention from three years to two years, and by releasing minors who should reside within the United States three years before arriving at their majority from the necessity of making such a declaration.

With the defeat of John Quincy Adams in 1829 the Democrats came again into power, and no change was made in the naturalization laws until after their defeat in 1860.

In 1862 a Republican Congress again modified the naturalization laws by permitting an alien who had served in the army and been honorably discharged to become a citizen without the usual preliminary declaration and without reference to the length of residence in the United States.

II.—EXPATRIATION.

The Democratic party did not assist the emigrant to become a citizen. Did it assist him in being recognized as such or asserting his rights as such?

Naturalization is the acquisition of citizenship by a person in a country to which he was before then an alien. Expatriation is, in one sense, the reverse of this. It is the loss of citizenship in the land of nativity. The assent of the Power whose allegiance he assumes is necessary to the first. Democratic authorities have, with a single exception, invariably maintained that the assent of the

Power whose allegiance he abandoned is essential to the second.

The authority of Henry Wheaton as an exponent of Democratic ideas cannot be questioned. He was appointed by President Jackson to be the *Chargé d'Affaires* of the United States at Berlin. He was promoted by President Van Buren to be the Minister of the United States at the same Court. In 1840 Johann P. Knoche, a native of Prussia, who had been naturalized in the United States, returned to his native land, and was required to perform military duty. He appealed to Mr. Wheaton for protection. Mr. Wheaton replied:

"It is not in my power to interfere in the manner you desire. Had you remained in the United States, or visited any other foreign Courts (except Prussia) on your lawful business you would have been protected by the American authorities, at home and abroad, in the enjoyment of all your rights and privileges as a naturalized citizen of the United States. But having returned to the country of your birth, your native domicile and natural character revert, so long as you remain in the Prussian domains, and you are bound in all respects to obey the laws exactly as if you had never emigrated."

William L. Marcy was a shining light of Democracy. He was a prominent member of the Albany regency, a Governor of New York, a leader in the Senate, and Secretary of State during the whole term of President Pierce's Administration. While he was Secretary of State, Simon Tousig, an Austrian by birth, came to the United States, resided here for some time, and returned to Austria with a passport from the Department of State. The Austrian military authorities took proceedings against him. He appealed to the Legation at Vienna for protection. Mr. Jackson, who was then *Chargé d'Affaires*, was a Democrat. He reported the case to the Department of State, and Mr. Marcy replied:

"Assuming all that could possibly belong to Tousig's case, that he had a domicile here and was actually clothed with the nationality of the United States, there is a feature in it which distinguishes it from that of Kosota. Tousig voluntarily returned to Austria, and placed himself within the reach of her municipal laws. He has voluntarily placed himself within the jurisdiction of the laws of Austria, and is suffering, as appears by the

case as you present it, for the acts he has done in violation of those laws while he was an Austrian subject."

Jeremiah S. Black was, and still is, regarded as a Democratic leader. In 1857 his official opinion was requested by the Secretary of State as to the status of a Bavarian who, after naturalization in the United States, had returned to Bavaria and taken up his abode there. He replied:

"There is no statute or other law of the United States which prevents either a native or naturalized citizen from severing his political connections with this Government, if he sees proper to do so in time of peace and for a purpose not injurious to the country. There is no mode of renunciation prescribed. In my opinion, if he emigrates, carries his family and effects with him, manifests a plain intention not to return, takes up his permanent residence abroad, and assumes the obligations of a subject of a foreign Government, this would imply a dissolution of his previous relations with the United States."

In a public life of half a century Lewis Cass was a leader among the Democracy. In October, 1857, he instructed Mr. Wright, of Indiana, who was then the representative of the United States at Berlin, to govern himself in dealing with such cases by the views of Secretary Marcy, who, he said, had "clearly and succinctly stated" the rule in such cases.

The treasonable conspiracies in the Democratic ranks loosened the hold which the party had upon Mr. Cass, and in 1859 he modified his views and instructed Mr. Wright to insist that "the moment a foreigner becomes naturalized his allegiance to his native country becomes severed forever."

But the declaration produced no result to the emigrant, and it was not until the States' rights Democrats had been beaten, both at the ballot-box and in the field, that a Republican administration was able to secure a practical recognition of the principle. Meanwhile, experience had shown that while tens of thousands of naturalized citizens had rushed to bear arms in support of the country of their adoption, some recreant cowards who had come here to avoid military service in Europe had flown back again to escape it here. Mr. Lincoln, in his annual message in 1863, said:

"There is also reason to believe that foreigners frequently become citizens of the United States for the sole purpose of evading the duties imposed by the laws of their native countries, to which on becoming naturalized here they at once repair, and, though never returning to the United States, they still claim the interposition of this Government as citizens."

It was thought unworthy of the United States that the mantle of its protection should be extended to such cases of fraud. When, therefore, a Republican administration succeeded in setting aside the precedents which have been established by its Democratic predecessors, and in securing the recognition in Germany of the right of an emigrant to expatriate himself, it did not hesitate to agree on its side that the expatriation must not be a sham. Justice to the honest emigrant who had become a citizen caused it to agree that if the emigrant, instead of really expatriating himself, should return to the land of his nativity to reside permanently, using his foreign nationality in the United States to avoid duties here, and his lately-acquired citizenship to avoid them in his native country, that he should cease to enjoy the benefit of acquired citizenship.

But how could a minister or a Secretary of State know whether the returned emigrant meant to go back to the United States or to stay in the land of his birth? How easy for the latter to reside in the old country year after year, with the declaration of a purpose to go back to the United States ever on his tongue? How can an officer disprove statements which such a person would not hesitate to make, except by the very fact itself of the continued residence? And this was adopted in the treaties as one of the standards of proof, and it was agreed that a two years' continuous residence might afford a presumption of an abandonment of naturalization.

This two years' residence does not of itself afford so strong a presumption that the authorities of the old Government can act upon it without notice of an intent to do so. In all cases they are required to give parties against whom they propose to proceed a reasonable notice, to hear their explanation, and to afford them an opportunity to return to America if they desire to do so.

Thus, the young German who desires to emigrate to America may now do so in safety. In safety he can return to his native land when naturalized here, can revisit his parents and friends, can reside in the old country, and can occupy himself in business or labor for his support while there, assured of the protection of the United States. He can only lose the protection when he fraudulently endeavors to convert a temporary visit into a permanent residence and attempts to commit a fraud upon both Governments.

Mr. Faulkner, a Democratic member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the present House of Representatives, in the name and on behalf of that committee, in a report made February 15, 1876, upon this very subject, says as follows, in reference to the treaty with the North German Confederation:

"Before the existence of that treaty constant difficulties arose between the two countries, growing out of a return of the naturalized German citizen to the land of his birth, and every page of our diplomatic correspondence shows how continually our representatives abroad were called upon to protect the rights of this class of our fellow-citizens; what delays and difficulties were encountered in the vindication of their rights, and how frequently the peace and good understanding between the two Governments were imperiled by the rigid adherence of Prussia and other German Powers to their own views of the obligations resting upon their native-born citizens. Much inconvenience, great loss of time, interruption of business, heavy fines, burdensome costs, and sometimes imprisonment, were the fate of many before their rights were recognized by these foreign Governments, and in no instance have we learned that any compensation or indemnity was ever accorded by the foreign Governments, or demanded by our own, for the cost, privation, and suffering encountered by our fellow-citizens in the vindication of their rights. Emigration itself, under many circumstances, was treated as an offense punishable by their laws.

"Much of this evil has ceased to exist since the formation of the treaty of 1868. That treaty has been carried out by the German Government with scrupulous honor and good faith.

* * * * *

"This treaty admits, in the broadest terms, the natural right of expatriation—a doctrine never before so fully and unconditionally recognized by the German Government.

"It concedes the free right of emigration, and the absolute discharge of every natural-

ized German citizen from all military service not actually required of him by some legal obligation then operative and in active force on the day of his emigration; so that upon his return to Germany the exemption continues as fully as if he was a natural-born citizen of the United States.

"The protection which this treaty gives to the naturalized citizen is of the highest and most solemn character, and gives to him a guarantee from both Governments that his rights shall be fully recognized and protected. This guarantee must necessarily extend to his full indemnity by the Government that unjustly interrupts, delays, or denies those rights.

"So sound and unassailable are the principles incorporated into this treaty that it would be difficult to conjecture any possible ground of objection to it, unless it be that provision which, having declared that if a German, naturalized in America, renews his residence in Germany without the intent to return to America he shall be held to have renounced his naturalization in the United States, also declares 'that the intent not to return may be held to exist when the person naturalized resides more than two years in the country of his birth.' The original phraseology of this treaty used the word 'shall,' but, at the instance of our Minister, the word 'may' was substituted; so, as it now stands, the two years' residence affords only presumptive evidence of an intention not to return, which may be rebutted by facts and circumstances.

"Your committee see no objection to this provision, which has been alike inserted into most of our subsequent naturalization treaties. It is intended to guard against the gross abuse of American citizenship, of which Germany especially affords so many examples. This citizenship is acquired by many, not for the honest and *bona fide* purpose of enjoying the blessings of our Government, and contributing to the advancement of our country, but as a convenient pretext to enable them to escape their obligations as citizens, both to the country of their birth and the country of their adoption. It has been found necessary, therefore, to fix some period that will test the intent of such persons. Two years have been fixed upon as a proper time to determine that question. But even under this treaty that period of time is only presumptive, and may be rebutted by showing that two years' or a longer residence is honest and *bona fide*, and consistent with the intent to return to the country of their adoption."

The naturalized German in the United States owes these benefits alone to Republican statesmen and Republican policy.

NOTES.

NOTE 1. The negotiations and treaties of the United States with foreign Powers can well be divided into and classed under *periods*. The first may be called "The period of the Revolution." By reference to the treaties of this period it will be seen that the question now raised was not presented or discussed.

NOTE 2. The next period may be designated that of "The War of 1812." This war was waged to vindicate the freedom of the national flag. It was the second, or real, war of independence. The main question was the claim of Great Britain to search our ships and seize our seamen or sailors on the high seas. The question now mooted did not arise. Modern Democrats claim to be the special successors of Jefferson and Madison, whose mantle, the former assert, has fallen on their shoulders. If the champions of the war of 1812 failed to assert all they ought these latter-day Democrats are estopped from complaint.

NOTE 3. The country had fully recovered from the war of 1812 only about 1820, when the institution of slavery intruded its hideous and hateful presence into the political arena. From the latter date until the rebellion, a period of over forty years, Democrats and Democratic administrations were engrossed with the task of aiding, protecting, and extending that institution, to which all other interests were subordinated.

Democrats, however, have ever been adepts at frauds, especially on the naturalization laws, thus easily making citizens of emigrants on their arrival on our shores in violation of law. And hence, by such false professions of friendship, fraudulently enticing these new citizens into the Democratic party. Nevertheless, as a matter of history, the treaties negotiated by Democratic administrations show that they did not in a single instance attempt the protection of adopted citizens on their return to their native land. This was the period almost consecutively down to 1861 of complete Democratic ascendancy, culminating in treason to the Constitution and the Union.

NOTE 4. There were negotiated by the United

States, prior to the rebellion, treaties as follows under the administrations of—

| | |
|--------------------------|----|
| (Prior to —, 1789) | 17 |
| Washington | 6 |
| John Adams | 4 |
| Jefferson | 6 |
| Madison | 6 |
| Monroe | 12 |
| J. Q. Adams | 13 |
| Jackson | 19 |
| Van Buren | 10 |
| Harrison | 1 |
| Tyler | 8 |
| Polk | 16 |
| Taylor | 5 |
| Fillmore | 11 |
| Pierce | 25 |
| Buchanan | 18 |

Total

177

Not one of the foregoing treaties embraces the subject under consideration, viz: the protection of adopted citizens on their return to the land of their nativity, though of the foregoing 107 were under special, modern Democratic auspices.

NOTE 5. But Republican administrations have negotiated since March 4, 1861, upward of *seventy-five treaties*, or nearly half as many as all prior to that date, a leading feature being a provision recognizing the right of expatriation theretofore denied, and granting personal rights and protection, mutually, to naturalized citizens on their return to their native land; limited, however, quite properly, to cases of naturalization and return to the good faith of the party.

This has been the period since 1861 of Republican administrations—a period full of trials by reason of Democratic treason, yet throughout the world the nation is at the very acme of fame.

CONCLUSION.

It will be seen that upon this, as upon all subjects, the Republican party is progressive. It has been the first to take this step forward, and if anything remains to be done it can be relied on to carry it to perfection.

No one can for a moment doubt that the present administration, with General Grant at its head, would be prompt to exert the whole power of the Government to protect its citizens in any part of the world. Nor will it hesitate, within the Constitution and laws, to protect citizens at home as well.

THE DEMOCRATIC RECORD—DARE THE NATION TRUST SUCH A PARTY?

When a political party goes before the people with a claim for their suffrage and the control of their Government and public affairs, the first and most natural impulse of the public mind is to know something of the past public record of the claimants. In order to aid in this very proper and necessary investigation the following facts and figures have been drawn from the official records and published. They are presented without note or comment. The reader will draw his own conclusions, and at his leisure answer from his own convictions the question: *Dare the nation trust such a party?*

JACKSON AND HIS TIMES—"TO THE VICTORS," ETC.

On March 4, 1829, Andrew Jackson, pledged to retrenchment, economy, and reform, was inaugurated President of the United States.

Proclaiming the maxim that "to the victors belong the spoils," Jackson let slip the "Furies of the Guillotine" in a wholesale proscription of the old and tried officials of former Administrations. John Q. Adams, in the preceding four years, had made but twelve changes—all for cause. In the preceding forty years, all his predecessors together had made only one hundred and thirty-two changes—of these Jefferson had removed sixty-two; but Jackson, in the genuine spirit of a Democratic reformer, in one year removed, it was estimated, one thousand five hundred officials—in one year nearly twelve times as many as by all his predecessors from the beginning of the Government. The officers removed were experienced, capable, and trusty. The character of those who filled their places—"Slamm, Bang & Co."—is attested by the reform which followed.

THE GREAT PUBLIC AND INDIAN LAND GRABS.

A rage for speculation in the public lands distinguished the period. General Lewis Cass, Secretary of War, who pocketed illegally, as extra allowances, the sum of \$68,000, united with Martin Van Buren, Secretary of State, Benjamin F. Butler, Attorney General, and others, in a land Credit Mobilier for speculation in public lands—for speculation in sales by the Government, of which they

were members. Amos Kendall, the Fourth Auditor, and subsequently Postmaster General, in like manner united with a Boston land company, for a fee of \$50,000, in the wholesale robbery of certain Indians in Mississippi of their lands—all swindling enterprises in contemptuous violation of the law, of which they were the administrators. (H. R. 194, second session Twenty-fourth Congress.)

THE GALPHIN SWINDLE.

In 1834 John Forsyth, of Georgia, succeeded Lewis McLane, of Delaware, as Secretary of State, in Jackson's Cabinet. In 1850 the payment of the notorious "Galphin swindle" scandalized the nation. By the Democracy it was denounced as "infamous"—as "without a precedent"—as "a clear and unmitigated swindle!" Their memories were bad. In 1837, before the Wise committee, John Ross, the Cherokee chief, testified that in 1835, in the Cherokee treaty of that year, an article covering the "Galphin" was inserted directly through the influence of "Mr. Forsyth, Secretary of State;" that it was urged, in the negotiations of the treaty, that Mr. Forsyth had great influence with the President; that "Mr. Forsyth could and would induce the President to grant a sum sufficient to cover the Galphin *additional* to the sum stipulated in the treaty if the Cherokees would sanction a treaty upon such terms." The article was consequently inserted. Mr. Forsyth admitted that he "advised" its insertion, as also his personal interest in the payment of both principal and interest. He had applied to both Secretaries of War, Eaton and Cass; as Secretary of State had certified the papers from the Department of State to the Secretary of War. General Cass had told him that the claim was just; and when the treaty was pending before the Senate had "conversed" with Senators urging its ratification; but pleads that, to them, his "appeals" were "founded solely on the justice of the claim"—"the hardship of the condition of the claimants."

Hence, lobbied in 1835 by Forsyth, Jackson's Secretary of State, approved by General Cass, his Secretary of War, and justified in 1837 by the Democratic majority of the Wise committee, engineered through Congress, in 1849, by another distinguished Democratic reformer, Mr. Burt, of South Carolina, and the principal paid by James K. Polk, the question of interest was only reserved and its liquidation by Polk only defeated for want of time.

THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT "INSOLVENT"
UNDER DEMOCRATIC RULE.

In 1834, after a hard battle, (from 1830,) Senators Thomas Ewing, of Ohio, and John M. Clayton, of Delaware, forced an inquiry by the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads into the condition of the Post Office Department. It found the Department "insolvent," a helpless prey to maladministration, corruption, robbery, and fraud. In the preceding administration, under John Q. Adams, the Department had been not only self-sustaining, but had contributed annually \$1,103,063 to the revenues of the nation. But now, in a few brief years, under Democratic reform, it was bankrupt, a burden upon the Treasury. (S. R. 422, first session Twenty-third Congress.)

Mr. Felix Grundy, of Tennessee, the Democratic chairman of the committee, was opposed to the investigation.

Postmaster General Barry refused to recognize its authority. He declared that he was responsible, not to the Senate, but to the President, and through him to the people. He refused to furnish the committee the information it requested, and it was forced to prosecute its labors under the greatest difficulties, among mutilated records and fabricated accounts in the greatest confusion. But even under such disadvantages it developed a condition of affairs utterly without a parallel in all our previous history.

THE "EXTRA-ALLOWANCE" FRAUDS IN DEMOCRATIC TIMES.

One of the greatest abuses of the Department was in its extra allowances, aggregating hundreds of thousands annually, frequently given without an increase of duty or service, without the authority of law, and in

many cases where there was an increase of service, "unreasonable, extravagant, and out of all proportion with such increase."

These extra allowances actually exhausted the whole postal revenues of States, and were granted practically as pensions to party favorites. This favoritism took a hundred shapes. Certain contractors were compelled to surrender their contracts for the benefit of others. Contracts were granted on bids different from advertisement, and others were altered or changed in material respects after they had been accepted. Proposals for carrying the mail were withheld from advertisement. The contracts, as in the case of the route from Chicago to Green Bay, actually given to clerks in the Department under other men's names, and the compensation on bids raised without an increase of service. Mail lines were authorized, "at a heavy expense," to run more than once daily without benefit to the public, and steamboat lines were established, by private contract without authority of law, at an enormous expense. Oppressive monopolies were actually established by the Department for the benefit of private parties. An instance is given in which an agreement, drawn by an officer of the Government and adopted at his pressing instance, with the sanction of the Postmaster General, was entered into between two companies of mail contractors to put down all opposition lines of coaches—all competition of passengers on their respective mail routes.

The contractors, in turn, divided by handsome loans never repaid—generously relieved the Postmaster General of his debts, and enabled the chief clerk to speculate largely in real estate in Washington. They also furnished the table of both with the most choice wines! *With shrewd business foresight the contractors lent their credit to the Department when threatened with collapse, and the Department responded by pledging its funds for the benefit of contractors.*

DEMOCRATIC SPECIAL-SERVICE PLUMS.

The "incidental expenses" of the Department—not its "contingent expenses," which were separate, distinct, and additional, but its "secret-service fund," in a single year, (1829,) increased to \$56,471, "exceeding

that of any former year," but in 1832, during the Presidential election, it suddenly swelled to \$88,000! It was principally the newspaper fund. After deducting the support of traveling partisan emissaries, under the title of "postal agents," it was the fund out of which the numerous party presses were permitted to richly share the plunder. So the Greenes, of the Boston *Statesman*, the elder Greene (Nathaniel) being postmaster at Boston, and certifying the accounts which were for "printed blanks, twine," etc. So the Hills, of the New Hampshire *Patriot*, the Shadrach Penns, of the Louisville *Public Advertiser*, the Albany *Argus*, New York *Courier and Enquirer*, the Washington *Globe*, the national organ, etc. The prices paid to F. P. Blair of the *Globe* were "enormous." Of the \$22,957.08 of "incidental expenses" during the Presidential election of 1832, \$13,673.31 were paid to the editors of newspapers. Of that Blair received \$8,386.50! During the election he received from this secret fund alone about \$116 daily for every day his paper was issued. The details are disgusting. Maladministration, corruption, and fraud run riot. The aggregate excess of expenditures in four years, as compared with the preceding four years, under Adams, was "\$3,336,859!" The amount of funds actually "sunk" by the Department since 1829 was "\$1,032,933;" and the aggregate of its "indebtedness" April 11, 1834, was "\$1,123,600!" To avoid immediate exposure by the collapse and closing of his Department, the Postmaster General was forced, besides his loans from contractors, to unlawfully contract loans, bearing interest, from the banks. There was no evading the judgment. (S. R. 422, first session Twenty-third Congress.) At the next session the report of the Democratic Committee of the House was even more damaging than the Senate's. Hence, under the unanimous verdict of the Senate, Postmaster General Barry was compelled to resign—to accept promotion to the mission to Spain, with its lucrative outfits and infits.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY "PET BANK" ROBBERIES.

About this time the affairs of the old Bank of the United States and its branches began to wane. By law the bank was the deposi-

tory of the Government revenues, and in consequence was the Treasury of the nation. In 1834, by a daring act of usurpation, President Jackson removed the deposits. He transferred them to certain "pet" State banks of the Democratic reformers, who claimed the revenues of the nation as the "spoils" of "THE PARTY!" The destruction of the Bank and subsequent explosion of the "Pet Banks" involved the loss of millions, the destruction and ruin of thousands of the business men and the business of the country—of \$500,000,000 of private capital—and the consequent suffering and want of tens of thousands of all ranks and classes throughout the Union. The Democratic reformers nevertheless applauded. They laughed at the misery and ruin they had caused, belittled their magnitude, and maintained and justified the removal in all its bearings.

INVESTIGATIONS AND EXPOSURES.

In 1837 the Garland committee published the "Wool-clip" correspondence between Secretary Woodbury and the deposit banks, exposed the criminal partisan favoritism of the Treasury in the distribution and management of the deposits or revenues of the nation as the "spoils" of "THE PARTY," and prepared the country for the disastrous explosion of the "Pet Banks" which followed. (H. R. 193, second session Twenty-fourth Congress.)

The Wise committee unearthed "Forsyth's Nankeen;" exposed the complicity of the high-toned Georgian Secretary of State in the "infamous Galphin swindle;" exposed Postmaster General Kendall's complicity, with "a \$50,000 fee," in the Boston scheme for the wholesale robbery of the Mississippi Indians of their lands; and developed Secretary Cass's corrupt favoritism in the dispensation of his patronage. (H. R. 194, second session Twenty-fourth Congress.)

FORGERY, ABSENTEISM, EMBEZZLEMENT, AND EXTORTION.

One T. B. Waterman was a *protege*—a copying clerk in the Pension Office, appointed by the General. Waterman forged the initials of Secretary Cass to an account; Waterman confessed the forgery, and the General paid the account. (H. R. 194, second session Twenty-fourth Congress.)

D. Azro A. Buck was a model reformer. He was appointed a clerk by Secretary Cass, July 8, 1835. About the same time Buck was also elected a member of the Vermont Legislature. Hence he did not report at the War Department for duty until December. In January, 1836, General Cass paid him for five months' service, when Buck had rendered but one. (H. R. 194, second session Twenty-fourth Congress.)

Lieutenant Thomas Johnson, a disbursing officer, lost, in gambling, two United States drafts for \$1,000 and \$1,500, respectively. These drafts were protested by a deposit bank—the Union Bank of Louisiana, at New Orleans—and an appeal for their payment was made to the War Department. The facts were all known. The Hon. Ambrose H. Sevier, of Arkansas, and the Hon. Richard M. Johnson, of Kentucky, (model Democratic reformers,) interested themselves in their payment, the pious Attorney General (B. F. Butler) uttered a favorable opinion, and Secretary Cass drew a warrant for their payment even after Woodbury had declined. (H. R. 194, second session Twenty-fourth Congress.)

At the same time Garret D. Wall, then United States District Attorney at Perth Amboy, N. J., and subsequently United States Senator from New Jersey, a distinguished Democratic reformer, assessed his modest fees for his influence with the Administration. (H. R. 194, second session Twenty-fourth Congress.)

In 1839 resistance to investigation was no longer possible. "No more packed committees," was the fiat of the nation—no more committees appointed by James K. Polk; and accordingly the House, by ballot, elected the celebrated Harlan committee.

Now, the proofs were overwhelming.

THE SWARTWOUT SWINDLES.

In April, 1829, Samuel Swartwout was appointed by President Jackson collector of the port of New York. He was notoriously impetuous, a reckless gambler in stocks, largely in debt, always in want of money, and wholly irresponsible financially. His default began within a year from the date of his appointment, and continued during eight years—for years with the knowledge of the authorities at Washington—for years (from

1834 to 1837) *without the bonds required by law to the Government for the safe-keeping of the millions in his hands.* (H. R. 313, third session Twenty-fifth Congress.)

His default was for \$1,225,705.69. The causes of his default, as the Harlan committee declare, were his irresponsibility in pecuniary character when appointed; the culpable disregard of law and neglect of official duty by the naval officer at New York, by the First Auditor and First Comptroller of the Treasury; the discontinuance of the use of banks of deposit; the consequent accumulation of vast sums in the hands of a stock gambler so improvident and reckless as Swartwout; and the negligence and failure of the Secretary of the Treasury to discharge his duty as head of the Treasury. In a word, by the abandonment at New York and Washington of all the checks thrown by law around the collection of the revenue. (H. R. 313, third session Twenty-fifth Congress.)

Swartwout was not removed. His commission expired March 28, 1838, and, being apprized in time, he, on the 16th of August, fled to England with his plunder, followed within a fortnight by William M. Price, (the district attorney for the southern district of New York,) a confederate in crime, and, like Swartwout, a defaulter in the sum of \$72,124.08. The default of General C. Gratiot, Chief Engineer United States army, was for \$50,000.

CORRUPTION AND FRAUD REIGN SUPREME.

In every bureau of the New York customs maladministration, corruption, and fraud reigned supreme, and here, with the origin of Democratic reform, began the "tyranny" of assessments for party purposes, levied for national and local elections upon the customs officers and in the navy-yard at New York, as throughout the country and in the executive departments at Washington.

The maladministration and corruption in the collection of the revenue from the sales of the public lands were as flagitious as in the customs. Out of sixty-odd receivers of public moneys fifty defaulted. A few instances will illustrate the whole:

A RECEIVER'S OFFICE MADE A BROKERS' DEN.

John Spencer was receiver at Fort Wayne, Ind. In May, 1836, the Secretary complain-

ed to Spencer that his accounts were in arrears, and appointed Nat. West, jr., of Indianapolis, as examiner, to investigate the office at Fort Wayne. Mr. West reports the office a broker's den for speculation and shaving. Spencer was about to be removed. Hon. Wm. Hendricks rushes to the rescue, and urges that Colonel Spencer is "an honest and honorable man;" that his removal "would, to some extent, produce excitement," "for he has many warm and influential friends, both at Fort Wayne and in Dearborn county. *Better let it be.*" Mr. Woodbury concluded to "*let it be.*" To Mr. Hendricks he writes: "I am happy to inform you that Mr. Spencer's explanations have been such that he will probably continue in office." Mr. Spencer's explanations were: "My Democratic friends think I ought not to leave until after we hold our election for President," "which I have concluded to wait." (H. R. 313, third session Twenty-fifth Congress.)

Wiley P. Harris was receiver at Columbus, Miss. "General Harris" was indorsed by his Democratic representative in Congress as "one of the main pillars of Democracy," as of "diffused and deserved popularity," and as "one of the earliest and most distinguished friends of the [Jackson's] Administration in Mississippi." In March, 1834, Secretary Roger B. Taney complained of his conduct, and after fifteen warnings, extending through two years, from Secretary Woodbury, "General Harris" was permitted to resign, and to nominate and secure the appointment of his successor, "Colonel Gordon D. Boyd, of Attala county." Whereupon the Secretary quietly entered on the books of the Treasury: "Balance due from Mr. Harris, \$109,178.08." (H. R. 313, third session Twenty-fifth Congress.)

FIFTY "HONEST" DEMOCRATIC OFFICIALS.

Colonel Boyd early fell into the footsteps of his illustrious predecessor. In June, 1837, Mr. Garesche reports the Colonel as a defaulter to the amount of \$50,000, but adds: "All concede that his intemperance has been his greatest crime." "The man seems really penitent, and I am inclined to think, in common with his friends, that he is honest, and has been led away by the example of his predecessor and a certain looseness in the code

of morality which here does not move in so limited a circle as it does with us at home. *Another receiver would probably follow in the footsteps of the two.* You will not, therefore, be surprised if I recommend his being retained." So it was decreed. In October, Boyd was allowed to resign, and the Secretary entered against his name: "Indebted \$50,000, as per last statement." And so with the remainder—Linn, Lewis, Alsbury, Dickson, Skinner, Hays, Simpson—fifty in all; making an aggregate default of \$825,678.28. (H. R. 313, third session Twenty-fifth Congress.)

JESSE HOYT'S SYSTEMATIC ROBBERIES.

In 1841-'42 the Poindexter commission investigated the maladministration of Swartwout's successor, Jesse Hoyt, the special *protege* of Martin Van Buren, who was appointed in March, 1838. At the date of his appointment, Hoyt, like Swartwout and Price, was notoriously impecunious, irresponsible financially, largely in debt, and a reckless speculator in stocks. His maladministration and systematic robberies of the Government and the importers amounted to piracy. Even in the incidental expenses of the customs—in the matter of stationery, printing, and the like—the pillage amounted to tens of thousands annually. No advertisement for the lowest bidder, no contract at stipulated prices for their supply, but ordered extravagantly and in the loosest manner, with no evidence required of the delivery of the article, they were paid for, on demand, at prices ranging from 100 to 200 per cent. greater than the current New York rates. (H. R. 669, second session Twenty-seventh Congress.)

Geo. A. Wasson, "a sort of factotum" for Hoyt, had a monopoly of the cartage at the public stores—two privileged carts, for the use and labor of which, in three years, Hoyt paid him \$94,430.92. In addition to his salary as storekeeper, Hoyt paid Wasson un'awfully, as deputy collector, \$1,500 per annum. (H. R. 669, second session Twenty-seventh Congress.)

In the seizure of goods under Hoyt's rapacious system of reappraisement, Wasson was one of a "triumvirate"—Wasson, Cairns, and Ives—of Hoyt's standing witnesses in the courts. This trained trio were

allowed to share the plunder. In a single instance in 1840 Hoyt paid Wasson, without vouchers, \$1,767.33 over and above the legal fees, for attendance on three trials, between May and October. Wasson was allowed to employ, for his private benefit, laborers hired and paid by the Government. He was a privileged purchaser, in his own name and in the names of others, at the sales of goods remaining nine months unclaimed in the public stores; allowed to plunder the public stores of goods in large quantities; to rob the custom-house of coal for his private use; in a word, to indulge in "a multitude of illegal practices and petty frauds" in addition to the goods, the luxuries, the salaries he absorbed from outside parties interested in the ruin of importers. (H. R. 669, second session Twenty-seventh Congress.)

Cairns and Ives, in like manner, equally shared in the plunder.

In January, 1840, a fire destroyed the Front-street stores. The goods saved were removed by the custom-house *attaches*—placed in an open lot—all entrance to which was refused to the importers for the purpose of identifying and recovering their property; but the goods, practically seized, were made up into piles or lots in which the vilest frauds were practiced to deceive purchasers—struck off at nominal sums to privileged parties in collusion with the officials, and the proceeds, after deducting fees, &c., pocketed by the collector. Thus the owners were robbed of goods aggregating in value \$1,000,000, the Government of \$400,000 as duties, and Hoyt pocketed about \$30,000 which should have been deposited in the Treasury for the benefit of the owners.

Hoyt also rented unlawfully five stores for the safe-keeping of goods entered at the custom-house. These stores yielded him a profit, per annum, of \$10,000, at a cost to the Government of \$30,000; or, in three years, in violation of law, but with the sanction of Secretary Woodbury, Hoyt, through these stores, pocketed \$30,000, at a cost to the nation of \$90,000! (H. R. 669, second session Twenty-seventh Congress.)

These are but characteristic instances in illustration of Hoyt's maladministration.

Their magnitude and extent were astounding. His criminal rapacity attained its shocking results in his system of fraudulent reappraisement. Goods regularly invoiced, and upon which all demands at the custom-house had been paid after examination and appraisement by the lawful appraisers of the customs, were followed by Wasson, Cairns, and Ives to Baltimore, Philadelphia, and other cities, again examined, reappraised, condemned, seized, and held for trial. At the trials the trained "triumvirate" were the standing witnesses. Nevertheless, "in nearly all these cases"—"thirty-two out of thirty-three"—tried in the United States district court for the southern district of New York, "the verdicts of the juries were in favor" of the importers. A like result attended the suits elsewhere. But in every case, whether favorable to the importer or not, the result to him was equally disastrous—absolute ruin to many through the unlawful seizure, supported by the systematic perjury of a trio trained in the service of Hoyt, with the sanction of the Secretary of the Treasury. (H. R. 669, second session Twenty-seventh Congress.)

A single instance will illustrate a multitude of similar cases. Mr. Bottomly swears in 1841: "Mr. Hoyt has taken from me the principal part of all the property I possessed." "In less than two years" Hoyt's rapacity had mulcted Mr. B. in costs aggregating \$200,000. "One-third" of all the English importers were ruined. Their property, (upon the sales of which they depended to meet their liabilities to the foreign manufacturer,) seized and locked up for an indefinite period, their failure was the inevitable result; and their bankruptcy carried with it the ruin of "a large number of English manufacturers." Mr. Bottomly had recently been in England, where goods were unusually cheap, and swears: "I could have procured assignments to the amount of \$1,000,000 for this season, (1841,) and even more, if I could have assured the consignees that they would not be seized after they had passed the custom-house, and the duties thereon had been paid." (H. R. 669, second session Twenty-seventh Congress.) As it was, they

dared not risk their goods within Hoyt's piratical jurisdiction.

HOYT, BUTLER, AND THE "TRIUMVIRATE."

In all this rapacious villainy, systematically pursued under the forms of law, under the grandest protestations of "patriotism" and "reform," again and again repeated, Ex-Attorney General Benjamin F. Butler, President Van Buren's old law-partner, the pious and prayerful president of the defunct bogus "Washington and Warren Bank" of Sandy Hill, and subsequently Price's successor as United States district attorney for the southern district of New York, was Hoyt's adviser and active coadjutor. Through it all the Government bore all the enormous expenses. Hoyt, Butler, and the "triumvirate"—Wasson, Cairns, and Ives—absorbed all the profits. Besides the immense sums accruing as fees in all cases of seizure under reappraisement, Hoyt's practice of retaining in his own hands, with the sanction of Secretary Woodbury, the amount of duties in such cases enabled him for indefinite periods of time—for years—to use the vast sums thus held for his private profit in loans to banks and brokers and in speculations of all kinds—in bolstering, by heavy deposits of the Government funds, such rotten institutions as the "North American Trust and Banking Company," in the stock of which he was a heavy gambler. By his own statement Hoyt thus constantly held of the Government funds, free of interest, an average of \$350,000, at a time in New York when money was demanding 5 per cent. per month. The sum thus held was shown to be much larger, probably not less than half a million, and "it was understood" and believed that his deposits in rotten "banks" were made under the sanction of the Secretary of the Treasury," at a time when Woodbury was "borrowing" for the Government "on Treasury notes bearing interest."

The exact aggregate of Hoyt's plunder is not known. The aggregate of his default was not less than \$500,000. His unlawful income—the aggregate of his pillage of importers and merchants—cannot be exactly estimated: it was known to be prodigious; but his annihilation of the commerce of the country, and the consequent heavy loss to

the Government in its revenues, while immensely increasing the cost of collecting the customs at New York, can be approximated. In one year, in 1840, as compared with 1839, the falling off of imports was \$40,232,763, involving, besides the heavy loss to the traffic of the nation, a loss to the Government, in its revenues, of \$7,651,765.53. As compared with 1825, the first year of Adams's Administration, the falling off in the aggregate of imports and exports in 1840 was \$2,975,142, while the cost of collection had increased in a corresponding ratio. In 1825 the amount of duties received at the New York custom-house was \$15,754,827.54, at an expense of collection of \$211,471.87; that is, at the rate of 1.34 per cent. In 1840 the amount received by Jesse Hoyt was \$7,591,760.95, at an expense of collection of \$563,829.39; that is, at the rate of 7.42 per cent. From 1825 to 1828, inclusive, under Adams, the average cost of collection was 1.43 per cent.; from 1838 to 1840, inclusive, under Hoyt, the average cost was 5.20 per cent., while the estimated increase in number of officers employed in the collection was "three hundred and thirty-seven per cent.," and the increased cost of collection "five hundred and fifty per cent."

A SAMPLE OF DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION.

So in all departments of the Government—maladministration and corruption rioted unrestrained. Contractors, commissioners, Indian agents, paymasters, officers of the army and navy, and Governors of Territories—all defaulted for thousands upon thousands. The Indians were special objects of rapacity. Cherokees, Chickasaws, Creeks, and Choctaws, outraged and oppressed in a thousand brutal ways, and forced into hostilities, were mercilessly murdered and deprived of their lands. In forty years, in Indian wars, the nation expended \$500,000,000; in the Seminole war alone, in seven years, \$50,000,000 in gold—an average in gold of \$7,000,000. Thus, Indian claims were the fattest of rotten perquisites. Their name was legion! The robberies attending the removal alone of the Cherokees and Choctaws, under the treaties of 1835 and 1846, are estimated, upon official data, at \$7,358,064.60. In these even Colonel Richard M. Johnson, Van Bu-

ren's Vice President, indulged the dominant propensities, and assessed \$18,000 fees for fraudulent collections.

Necessarily, in every branch of the service, the expenditures increased enormously, while the revenues decreased. Under Adams, the heaviest annual current expenditures amounted to \$13,296,041.45; under Jackson's reform they suddenly swelled to \$29,621,807.82; under Van Buren's, to \$31,793,587.24. The aggregate of the current expenditures of Adams' Administration was \$50,501,914.31. Under Jackson the aggregate of his first term was \$56,270,480.62; of his second term, \$88,275,930.46; total, \$143,380,307. Under Van Buren's single term, \$112,188,692.16.

POLK'S ADMINISTRATION AND FRAUDS ON THE INDIANS.

Under Polk the Indian frauds were enormous. These are embraced in a settlement by Commissioner Medill, and covered in a report by William L. Marcy, Secretary of War, dated May 20, 1848, to Congress. Under the treaties of 1835 and 1846 the Cherokees were entitled to \$5,000,000, less \$1,000,000, for the purchase of lands to which they were to emigrate, and the creation of a national fund for the tribe, leaving due the Cherokees \$4,000,000, which should have been paid them. Against that sum, at the settlement, as per William L. Marcy, fraudulent charges, by the agents and others, were audited, amounting to \$3,815,000, leaving for the Indians only \$184,071.28 of their \$4,000,000 under the treaties. Of course the Indians demurred. An appropriation was subsequently made of \$1,256,500.27; and the agents were instructed to demand from the Indians receipts in full before the payment of even that sum. The Indians were compelled to submit. Thus, in the removal of the Cherokees, under the treaties of 1835 and 1846, as per William L. Marcy's settlement, the Indians were deliberately robbed of \$2,743,499.27.

Under the same treaties, at the same time, the Government was mulcted in a like sum. The amount paid by the Government in the transportation of the Indians was \$2,915,141.58. An offer was made to transport and subsist the Indians at \$40 per head. Even

the Indians proposed to transport and subsist themselves at the same rate—\$40 per head—which for 13,149 Indians (the number charged for) would amount to \$525,960, showing a swindle, as compared with the amount actually paid by the Government, of \$2,389,181.58. The records of the Indian office show that the contractors charged for 1,633 more than were actually removed, which, at \$40 per head, amounted to \$65,320. The original contractors were compelled by the Government agents to transfer their contracts to second parties, and to the original contractors were awarded as damages the sum of \$227,362.52. The records also show that the Cherokee fund was defrauded by a citizen agent of \$68,145.64, and by two army officers of \$76,976.54, making the total fraud against the Government \$2,827,000.28. In like manner the Choctaws were swindled of \$1,787,565.05.

To recapitulate:

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Aggregate fraud against Government under the treaties of 1835-'46 | \$2,827,000.28 |
| Aggregate fraud against Cherokees under same treaties | 2,743,499.27 |
| Aggregate fraud against Choctaws | 1,787,565.05 |
| Total | *7,358,064.60 |

THE MEXICAN WAR AND DEMOCRATIC CORRUPTION.

The Mexican war exacted an expenditure of hundreds of millions and the lives of 25,000 of our citizens. Corruption in the Government stalked unrestrained. The Eli Moores, the Purdys, the Morrisises, the Patrick Collinses, the Beards, the Scotts, the Kennerlies, the Denbys, and the Wetmores—a host of pillagers—Indian agents, sub-Indian agents, contractors, disbursing officers of the army and navy, navy agents, pension agents, marshals, receivers of public moneys, commercial agents, surveyors, inspectors, and collectors of the customs, plundered their million.

Under Pierce Washington "rings" rejoiced in mammoth fraud in the building of the Capitol wings and in the extension of the Treasury building, and were encouraged in their pillage by Pierce's "outlaws of the

*These facts and figures are from official statements and tables prepared at the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Treasury." The actual and proposed plunder was immense. The aggregate amount of spoils proposed in the first Congress under Pierce was estimated at three hundred millions!—\$120,000,000 in obedience to the decree of the Ostend conference for the purchase of Cuba; \$20,000,000 for the Gadsden purchase, and so on in like acts—all for the aggrandizement of slavery.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL SWINDLES THE GOVERNMENT.

The maladministration of the Post Office Department under Campbell, Pierce's Postmaster General, rivaled that under Barry and Kendall. Even "the sale of letters and papers was made an item of revenue." "Bank-bills, checks, and insurance policies were sold in piles," and a Connecticut mill, buying two thousand of these, exposed the crime.

PRECEDENTS FOR ROBESON.

Secretaries of the Navy anticipated Mr Robeson in transactions now denounced as crimes by the Democracy. Hundreds of thousands of the national funds were intrusted to rotten banking institutions like Fitch & Co.'s. But Judge Mason, styled by the *Union*—the Washington organ of Democratic reform—as "the accomplished and excellent Secretary of the Navy," reformed even upon that. Nathaniel Denby was the agent of the Navy Department at Marseilles, France. Osborne was a Richmond merchant. They defaulted for the sum of \$159,433.67. At a time when Denby had an unexpended balance on hand of nearly \$60,000, with no demands for its use, Judge Mason deposited with the Richmond merchant (Osborne) \$100,000 for the use of Denby. Denby had no use for the money. He even, from his prison under Fillmore, urged in extenuation of his default that he had had no "advices" of this deposit with Osborne. But Osborne says:

"These moneys (\$100,000) I received as [Mr. Denby's] agent, paying interest for them, and consequently, as would be inferred from this circumstance, and also by express understanding, had the use of the funds until called for. All these funds were in the hands of various European and American houses; and in consequence of their failures my losses were so great as to involve my whole estate in ruin and leave me destitute."

THE CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING FRAUDS AND OTHER PARTY SPOILS.

Under Buchanan, as under Jackson and Van Buren, the revenue and the offices were again the "spoils" of "THE PARTY." Loyalty to the Administration, allegiance to slavery, were the conditions of a division. The profits of the Congressional printing were great. The bills of the Printer immense. But the profits of the Executive printing and binding and the printing of the postal blanks were enormous. Out of these profits—the newspaper corruption fund, disbursed by the notorious Cornelius Wendell—presses like the *Pennsylvanian*, the *Philadelphia Argus*, the *Washington Union*, &c., received a subsidy as a condition of slavishly supporting the Administration. Papers like the *Cleveland National Democrat* were established under the patronage of the Government by office-holders for like purposes—the defense of border ruffianism, Lecompton, and sectional strife. The navy-yards, custom-houses, and post offices were degraded into corrupt party machines. Editors of servile sheets, rendering to Government no service, were borne upon their rolls, drawing pay—like Baker, of the *Pennsylvanian*, and the noted Theophilus Fisk, of the *Argus*, at Philadelphia; William M. Browne, of the *Journal of Commerce*, at New York; Harry Scovel, of the *Free Press*, at Detroit, and the Henry J. Alvords in other sections—men like Cummings, at Philadelphia, pocketing pay in the name of subordinates for which no services were rendered; like Clements, at the Philadelphia navy-yard, unable to write, but useful as a politician, appointed and drawing pay as clerks while working as bricklayers; like the infamous Michael C. Murphy, a foreman in the New York yard, and the principal in a \$35,000 jewelry robbery, retained as party strikers. Fealty to party covered all crimes. Swindling contracts, like the notorious live-oak contracts to Swift, were awarded to party favorites in payment of party services. Thousands of dollars were regularly assessed for party purposes, even three times in the same year, upon the Departments at Washington, upon the navy-yards, custom-houses, and post offices throughout the country; even assessments, in the form of contributions, for

the support of the organ, the *Constitution*. Woe to the unfortunate wight who rebelled; his independence was instantly rewarded by decapitation. Office-holders were organized into mercenary corps for the control of National and State politics; and by wholesale frauds at elections—by frauds upon the registry—by the issue and distribution of fraudulent naturalization papers—by ballot-box stuffing and frauds in counting votes, enabled corrupt minorities to dominate for years the intelligent majorities of the great States of Pennsylvania and New York. Defaults like Isaac V. Fowler's, the postmaster at New York, for \$75,000, were but bagatelles compared with Thompson's and Floyd's grander system of pillage. The abstraction by Floyd's nephew, Godard Bailey, in 1860, from the Interior Department, under Jacob Thompson, of \$870,000 of Indian trust bonds, and their transfer to Russell, Majors & Waddell, upon Secretary Floyd's fraudulent acceptances, under a contract of that firm with the War Department, and similar fraudulent acceptances by Floyd, as shown by the records of the War Department, to the amount of \$5,339,335, aggregated a fraud of \$6,137,395, to be borne either by the Government or the holder.

THE INDIAN BONDS THEFT.

Under the numerous Indian treaties, up to 1861, with the Cherokees, Chickasaws, Choctaws, Creeks, and others, funds in large amounts (held under the solemn pledges of the nation in trust for those tribes) had accumulated in the hands of the Secretaries of War, Treasury, and Interior. These were invested by Secretaries Woodbury and Thompson in nearly valueless Southern stocks and State bonds. Even the Smithsonian trust fund (\$538,000) was sunk with the rest. By Woodbury \$1,744,166.66 were thus invested, upon which the Government has paid as interest \$1,571,708. Of this fund, under Buchanan, Secretary Thompson invested in like stocks and State bonds \$1,970,800, upon which the Government has paid as interest \$1,575,435, all in violation of law, and causing a total loss to the nation of \$6,862,109.66.

Hence, under Buchanan, under Democratic reform, the loss to the Government by defaults and fraud was \$3.81 in every \$1,000 collected

and disbursed; under Lincoln, but \$0.76; under Grant, only \$0.34. Under Buchanan, five times greater than under Lincoln. Under Buchanan, over eleven times greater than under Grant.

Such is a brief history of Democratic reform—such the character of its public men—not of one period only, but of its every period, from its origin under Jefferson to its close, in 1861, under Buchanan. Maladministration, malfeasance, spoliation, corruption, and fraud—every vile administrative crime—dominated amid executive usurpation and military tyranny, supported by laws outraging every human right.

THE DEMOCRACY OF TO-DAY.

Turning from the past terrible record of the party, the question naturally arises: "Has the Democracy, as a party, improved?" "Is it the author of a single good act in the last quarter of a century?" This question has been asked before, but never answered. Take, for example, the nomination of Samuel J. Tilden for the Presidency: It is fair to conclude that as is the man of their choice so is the party he represents. One illustration of his character for veracity is sufficient.

On December 26, 1863, in his answer to the Mr. Tilden swore to a complaint in the Circuit Court of the United States in the suit which he said: "I hereby certify of the St. Louis, Alton and Terre Haute Railroad Company against statement of the gains, himself and others, profits, or income of which answer was filed Samuel J. Tilden, of recently, Mr. Tilden the city of New York, swore under oath as and county of New follows: York, State of New York, whether derived from any kind of property, rents, interests, of \$10,000 against said dividends, salary, or second mortgage bondholders, from any profession, holders, and the said trade, employment, or charge, was paid by or vocation, or from any on behalf of said second other source whatever, mortgage bondholders er, from 1st day of Jan. on the 17th of October, vary to 31st day of 1862; * * * that the December, 1862, both defendant, Tilden, for a days inclusive, and part of his services subject to an income aforesaid, also made a tax under the excise charge of the like sum law of the United of \$10,000 on account of States. Income from professional services rendered to the first mortgage bondholders and the receivers, which was paid to him by the said Azariah C. Flagg; * * * and which payment appears under date of November 7, 1862, in a statement annexed to the first report aforesaid, as having been receipted for by the said Tilden, on account of professional services."

Is Mr. Tilden a willful perjurer? And if so, is he a fit person to be President of the United States?

DARE THE NATION TRUST SUCH A PARTY?

Dare the nation again trust such a party? In what have Republicans forfeited the confidence of the Republic? Shall Belknap's single crime—his sale of a post-tradership to the Democrat Marsh—the only offense of which it has been convicted—an accident, not the rule of its administration—blot out its record of magnificent achievements—its triumphant restoration of the Union against the murderous efforts of the Democracy to destroy it; its steady development and careful husbandry of the grand resources of the Nation, increasing immensely the wealth and happiness and comforts of the people? Even admitting Belknap's Republicanism—a mooted question—into what lilliputian proportions, in character and degree, does his

single crime dwarf before the greater and more heinous villainy of the Democracy—before those of its highest officials—its truest representatives in office; its Richard M. Johnsons, Vice President of the United States; its Martin Van Burens and John Forsyth, Secretaries of State; its Levi Woodburys, Secretary of the Treasury; its Lewis Casses and John B. Floyds, Secretaries of War; its John Y. Masons, Secretary of the Navy; its Jacob Thompsons, Secretary of the Interior; its William T. Barrys and Amos Kendalls, Postmasters General; its Hoyts, Harrises, and Boyds, whose maladministration and corruption stand without a parallel in history? A single crime—a comparatively petty offense, by which the nation loses nothing, not a penny—against a multitude by which the nation has been pillaged of hundreds of millions—aye, through the rebellion, of thousands of millions!

HISTORY OF THE WHITE LINE ORGANIZATION IN MISSISSIPPI.

In Mississippi the White Line organization is not new. Beginning with the *ante-war* period, it dates from 1865. This policy lay at the foundation of President Johnson's *so-called* reconstruction. When the war closed the constitution of the State was only amended so as to recognize the abolition of slavery. This was absolutely required by the Government. But negroes were not made citizens. As to them the old constitution remained unchanged. In October, 1865, State officers, a legislature, and county officers were elected. B. G. Humphries, an ex-Confederate major general, was chosen Governor. There were no party organizations, but Confederate records were the only recommendation for office. No man need apply who has not been loyal to the rebellion. The new government was installed in October, and the military were withdrawn.

The Legislature began its work by defining the status of the emancipated race. The laws then enacted will speak for themselves, and brief extracts verified by the official acts as published are given below.

In his inaugural of date October 16, 1865,

15a

Governor Humphries said: "The planter cannot venture upon the cultivation of the great staple unless the laborer is *compelled* to comply with his contract, remaining and performing his proper amount of labor, day after day, and week after week, through the year; and if he *attempts to escape*, he should be *returned* to his employer, and *forced to work* until the time for which he has contracted has expired." By oversight or otherwise the Governor forgot to say anything about *compensation for the forced labor* he proposes, and this remained a minor consideration in the legislation that followed, as will be seen in the laws quoted:

THE BLACK CODE.

AN ACT to confer *Civil Rights* on freedmen, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, That all freedmen, free negroes, and mulattoes may sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded in all the courts of law and equity in this State, and may acquire *personal property* and choses in action by descent or purchase, and may dispose of the same in the same manner and to the same extent that white persons may: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not be so construed as to allow any freedman, free negro, or mulatto to rent or lease

any land or tenements, except in incorporated towns and cities, in which places the incorporated authorities shall control the same.

SEC. 2. * * * That it shall not be lawful for any freedman, free negro, or mulatto to intermarry with any white person, nor for any white person to intermarry with any freedman, free negro, or mulatto, and any person who shall so intermarry shall be deemed guilty of felony, and on conviction thereof shall be confined in the State penitentiary for life.

SEC. 5. That every freedman, free negro, or mulatto shall, on the second Monday of January, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-six, (1866,) and annually thereafter, have a lawful home or employment, and shall have written evidence thereof as follows, to wit: If living in any incorporated city, town, or village, a license from the Mayor thereof, and if living outside of any incorporated city, town, or village, from the member of the board of police of his beat, authorizing him or her to do irregular and job work on a written contract, as provided in section six of this act: which license may be revoked, for cause, at any time by the authority granting the same.

SEC. 6. That if the laborer shall quit the service of the employer before expiration of his term of service without good cause he shall forfeit his wages for that year up to the time of quitting.

SEC. 7. That every civil officer shall, and every person may arrest and carry back to his legal employer any freedman, free negro, or mulatto, who shall have quit the service of his or her employer before the expiration of his or her term of service without good cause, and said officer and person shall be entitled to receive for arresting and carrying back every deserting employe aforesaid the sum of five dollars, and ten cents per mile from the place of arrest to the place of delivery, and the same shall be paid by the employer, and held as a set-off for so much against the wages of said deserting employe.

SEC. 8. That upon affidavit made by the employer of any freedman, free negro, or mulatto, or other credible person, before any justice of the peace or member of the board of police, that any freedman, free negro, or mulatto legally employed by said employer has illegally deserted said employment, such justice of the peace or member of the board of police shall issue his warrant or warrants, returnable before himself or other such officers, directed to any sheriff, constable, or special deputy, commanding him to arrest said deserter and return him or her to said employer, and the like proceedings shall be had as provided in the preceding section; and it shall be lawful for any officer to whom such warrant shall be directed to execute said warrant in any county of

this State, and that said warrant may be transmitted without indorsement to any like officer of another county, to be executed and returned as aforesaid, and the said employer shall pay the cost of warrants and arrest and return, which shall be a set-off for so much against the wages of said deserter.

SEC. 9. That if any person shall persuade, or attempt to persuade, entice, or cause any freedman, free negro, or mulatto to desert from the legal employment of any person before the expiration of his or her term of service, or shall knowingly employ any such deserting freedman, free negro, or mulatto, or shall knowingly give or sell to any such deserting freedman, free negro, or mulatto any food, raiment, or other thing, he or she shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be fined not less than twenty-five dollars, and not more than two hundred dollars and the costs, and if said fine and costs shall not be immediately paid, the court shall sentence said convict to not exceeding two months' imprisonment in the county jail, and he or she shall moreover be liable to the party injured in damages: Provided, If any person shall, or shall attempt to persuade, entice, or cause any freedman, free negro, or mulatto to desert from any legal employment of any person with the view to employ said freedman, free negro, or mulatto, such person, on conviction, shall be fined not less than fifty dollars, and not more than five hundred dollars and costs, and if said fine and costs shall not be immediately paid the court shall sentence said convict to not exceeding six months' imprisonment in the county jail.

Approved November 25, 1865. (Pamphlet acts of 1865, page 82.)

AN ACT to amend the Vagrant laws of Mississippi.

* * * * *

SEC. 2. Be it enacted, &c., That all freedmen, free negroes, and mulattoes in this State over the age of eighteen years found on the second Monday in January, 1866, or thereafter, with no lawful employment or business, or found UNLAWFULLY ASSEMBLING themselves together, either in the day or night time, and all white persons so assembling with freedmen, free negroes, or mulattoes or usually ASSOCIATING with freedmen, &c., on terms of equality, or living in adultery or fornication with a freed woman, free negro, or mulatto, shall be deemed vagrants, and on conviction thereof, shall be fined in the sum of not exceeding, in case of a freedman, free negro, or mulatto fifty dollars, and a white man two hundred dollars, and imprisoned at the discretion of the court, the free negro not exceeding ten days, and the white man not exceeding six months.

* * * * *

SEC. 5. That all fines and forfeitures col-

lected under this act shall be paid into the county treasury, for general county purposes, and in case any freedman, free negro, or mulatto shall fail for five days after the imposition of any fine or forfeiture upon him or her for violation of any of the provisions of this act to pay the same, that it shall be, and it is hereby, made the duty of the sheriff of the proper county to hire out said freedman, free negro, or mulatto to any person who will, for the shortest period of service, pay said fine or forfeiture, and all costs: *Provided, A preference shall be given to the employer, if there be one, in which case the employer shall be entitled to deduct and retain the amount so paid from the wages of such freedman, free negro, or mulatto then due or to become due, and in case such freedman, free negro, or mulatto cannot be hired out, he or she may be dealt with as a pauper.*

SEC. 6. * * That it is hereby made the duty of the board of county police of each county of this State to levy a poll or capitation tax on each and every freedman, free negro, or mulatto (male and female) between the ages of eighteen and sixty years, not to exceed the sum of one dollar annually to each person so taxed, which tax when collected shall be paid into the county treasurer's hands, and shall constitute a fund to be called the freedmen's pauper fund, which shall be applied by the commissioner of the poor of the freedmen, &c., of this State.

SEC. 7. *be it enacted, That if any freedman, or free negro, or mulatto shall fail or refuse to pay any tax levied according to the provisions of the sixth section of this act it shall be prima facie evidence of vagrancy, and it shall be the duty of the sheriff to arrest such freedman, &c., &c., or such person refusing or neglecting to pay such tax, and proceed at once to hire for the shortest time such delinquent tax-payer to any one who will pay the said tax, with accruing costs, giving preference to the employer, if there be one.*

Approved November 24, 1865.

AN ACT to punish certain offenses therein named and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, That no freedman, free negro, or mulatto, not in the military service of the United States Government and not licensed to do so by the board of police of his or her county, shall keep or carry fire-arms of any kind, or any ammunition, dirk, or bowie knife; and on conviction thereof, in the county court, shall be punished by fine, not exceeding ten dollars, and pay the costs of such proceeding, and all such arms or ammunition shall be forfeited to the informer, and it shall be the duty of every civil and military officer to arrest any freedman, free negro, or mulatto found with any such arms or

ammunition, and cause him to be committed for trial in default of bail.

SEC. 2. That any freedman, free negro, or mulatto committing riot, making seditious speeches, insulting gestures, largely, or acts, or assaults on any person, or committing any other misdemeanor, the punishment of which is not specifically provided for by law, shall, upon conviction thereof in the county court, be fined not less than ten dollars, and not more than one hundred dollars, and may be imprisoned, at the discretion of the court, not exceeding thirty days.

SEC. 3. That if any white person shall sell, lend, or give to any freedman, &c., &c., any fire-arms, dirk, or bowie knife, or ammunition, or any spirituous or intoxicating liquors, such person or persons so offending, upon conviction thereof in the county court of his or her county, shall be fined not exceeding fifty dollars, and may be imprisoned, at the discretion of the court, not exceeding thirty days.

SEC. 4. That all the penal and criminal laws now in force in the State defining offenses and prescribing the mode of punishment for crimes and misdemeanors committed by SLAVES, FREE NEGROES, OR MULATTOS be, and the same are hereby, ENACTED AND DECLARED TO BE IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT against freedmen, negroes, and mulattoes, except so far as the modes and manner of trial and punishment have been changed or altered by law.

SEC. 5. That if any freedman, free negro, mulatto, convicted of any of the misdemeanors provided against in this act shall fail or refuse for the space of five days after conviction to pay the fine and costs imposed, such persons shall be hired out by the sheriff or other officers at public outcry to any white person who will pay said fine and costs, and take such convict for the shortest time.

Approved November 29, 1865.

AN ACT to regulate the relation of MASTER and apprentice, as relates to FREEDMEN, FREE NEGROES, and MULATTOS.

*Be it enacted, &c., That it shall be the duty of all sheriffs, justices of the peace, and other civil officers of the several counties in this State to report to the probate courts of their respective counties semi-annually, at the January and July terms of said court, all freedmen, free negroes, and mulattoes under the age of eighteen within their respective counties, beats, or districts, who are orphans, or whose parent or parents have not the means, or who refuse to provide for and support said minors, and thereupon it shall be duty of the said court to order the clerk of said probate court to apprentice said minors to some competent and suitable person on such terms as the court may direct: *Provided, That the former owner of said minors shall have the preference.* * * **

SEC. 3. That in the management and control of said apprentices said master or mistress shall have power to inflict such MODERATE CORPORAL CHASTISEMENT as a father or guardian is allowed to inflict on his or her child or ward at common law. * * *

SEC. 4. That if any apprentice shall leave the employment of his or her master or mistress without his or her consent, said master or mistress may pursue and recapture said apprentice and bring him or her before any justice of the peace of the county, whose duty it shall be to remand said apprentice to the service of his or her master or mistress, and in the event of a refusal on the part of said apprentice so to return, then said justice shall commit said apprentice to the jail of said county, on failure to give bond, until the next term of the county court, and it shall be the duty of said court at the first term thereafter to investigate said case, and if the court shall be of the opinion that said apprentice left the employment of his or her master or mistress without good cause to order him or her to be punished, as provided for the punishment of hired freedmen, as may be from time to time provided for by law, for desertion, until he or she shall agree to return to his or her master or mistress.

SEC. 5. That if any person entice away any apprentice from his or her master or mistress, or shall knowingly employ an apprentice, or furnish him or her food, or clothing, without the written consent of his or her master or mistress, or shall sell or give said apprentice ardent spirits without such consent, said person so offending shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and shall, on conviction thereof, before the county court, be punished as provided for the punishment of persons enticing from their employer hired freedmen, free negroes, and mulattoes.

Approved November 22, 1865.

An illustration of the effect of the fifth section of the first act quoted may not be out of place here. It will be seen by section two of the act amending the vagrant laws, that all freedmen, free negroes, or mulattoes over the age of eighteen, found without employment on the second Monday of January of each year, were deemed and declared vagrants, and liable to heavy fine and imprisonment. Under the foregoing fifth section no one was permitted to work without first obtaining license. But the absolute necessity to work was also made a privilege, and licenses had to be purchased. The prices ranged from fifty cents to one dollar per month, the city authorities themselves regulating the amount. Poverty was thus made a double crime.

A case of this kind arose in 1866, under the first section of the above act. An order issued by Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of War, in 1865, permitted soldiers to purchase of the Government the muskets they carried in the service, by paying the regulation price, and take them to their homes as personal property. A number of colored United States soldiers mustered out in Mississippi availed themselves of this privilege, and one of them returned to his home near Canton. He was arrested, tried, and convicted under the first section, and his rifle taken from him by the white informer. Major Williams, of the Freedmen's Bureau, carried the case to the supreme court of the State, which sustained the action of the lower court, Chief Justice Handy delivering an elaborate opinion in the case.

STATE TAXATION.

The Democratic maxim of "no taxation without representation" was utterly unknown to the Democracy when they were in power. They had not only reduced the negro to a condition of oppressive vassalage, with no rights that any one was bound to respect, but weighed down his beggared hands with almost the entire burden of government. *The poor whites and the negroes paid three-fourths of the taxes of the State, as will be seen below.*

The State tax upon lands was only one-tenth of one per cent. of the value given to the assessor by the owner of the land.

Under the same law, (Acts of 1865, page 216,) "all blacksmiths, bakers, butchers, brickmakers, carriagemakers, carpenters, printers, shoemakers, tailors, tanners, painters, milliners," &c., &c., were required to pay *twenty-five cents on every hundred dollars' worth of their GROSS EARNINGS!*

Thus the poorest man in the State, with nothing but the proceeds of his hard, honest daily toil to support his family, was made to pay *two and a half times* as much tax on the small pittance he earned by "the sweat of his brow" as the wealthy planter paid on his fine estate.

ITS PRACTICAL WORKINGS.

The practical workings of this barbarous system was shown by Attorney General Morris, from the tax-rolls of Warren county in 1868:

Col. Joseph E. Davis, total taxes on 3,793 acres of bottom land, which he sold for \$50,000, all told..... \$141 14
 Heirs of Gen. John A. Quitman, on 6,810 acres of bottom land, handsomely improved, including a plantation which was rented for \$30,000 per annum. It was assessed the same year. Total taxes, all told..... 188 64

"LOOK ON THIS PICTURE."

Mr. Philip Gilbert, shoemaker, pays annually 75 28
 Mr. P. Crecy, on a salary of \$1,200, with no property, pays \$33 00
 Mr. Vetch, a barber, and no property but his soap, shears, and razors, pays 107 63
 Pompey Higgins, a colored drayman, on his dray and two mules, pays 33 82
 Mr. Fred. Lord, a butcher, pays annually 243 70

These figures show briefly how the Democratic party set systematically about to oppress, impoverish, AND ROB THE POOR AND EXEMPT THE RICH!

It was a part of the general plan to "keep the negro in his place," and compel him to serve and support the white man.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

was passed over President Johnson's veto on the 9th day of April, 1866. In his special message of October 16, 1866, Governor Humphries said: "The civil-rights bill passed by Congress at its recent session conflicts directly with many of our State laws, and has been a fruitful source of disturbance. Immediately after your adjournment, in December, 1865, I appointed commissioners to visit the city of Washington, lay these laws before the President, and request him to indicate which of them the military authorities would be allowed to nullify. The President gave full assurances that none of them should be nullified except by the civil courts of the land."

As the "civil courts" of Mississippi were in full sympathy with the spirit of the State legislation, it is easy to understand which of the laws were "nullified" by them.

RECONSTRUCTION.

The reconstruction acts were approved March 7, 1867. They required that a majority of the registered voters of the State should vote "for convention," or it would be no election. It was the negro's first vote.

At first many whites "accepted the Congressional plan as a choice of evils," and advocated its adoption, but by the time the election took place—in December, 1867—the fewest possible number voted at all. The following paragraphs from the Vicksburg *Times* of that date will show the *animus* of the opposition:

"STAY AWAY FROM THE POLLS.

"We again urge every decent white man, every honorable gentleman of the Caucasian race, to avoid General Ord's election as he would pestilence and a prison. As this advice does not apply to, and is not intended for, the white sneaks of the Loyal League, we shall expect the last-named despicable vermin out in all their strength.

"THE IMMORTAL FIGHT.

"We are gratified to be able to announce to the readers of the *Times* that at the courthouse yesterday, the only place open to the whole people, there were cast the votes of eight people only. We tried to get the names of the interesting sneaks who voted, but failed, though the *Times* office was and is ready to pay a dollar for the name of each voter. We shall publish the names of those voters if we can get them, and some day we shall; but if we do not, we shall with pride chronicle the fact that in the heroic city of Vicksburg, the gallant Sarragossa of the South, that there were only eight cowards, dogs, and scoundrels of the Mygatt and McKee breed."

But the convention was carried by a small majority, there being almost a solid colored vote cast in its favor. The constitutional convention assembled the first of January, 1868, and proceeded to frame a constitution. It was largely Republican from the fact mainly that Democrats had indignantly refused to touch reconstruction in any way, and were very bitter in denouncing all who did. On the 15th of January a Democratic State convention assembled at Jackson and adopted the following

WHITE-LINE RESOLUTIONS:

"Resolved, That the military bills of Congress for the reconstruction of the so-called rebel States are *unconstitutional*, and oppressive in all their particulars, and should be resisted by the unanimous voice of the people at the ballot-box.

"Resolved, That the nefarious design of the Republican party in Congress to place the white men of the Southern States under the governmental control of their late slaves, and degrade the Caucasian race as the inferior of the African negro, is a crime against

the civilization of the age, which need only to be mentioned to be scorned by every intelligent mind, and we therefore call upon the people of Mississippi to vindicate alike the superiority of their race over the negro and their political power to maintain constitutional liberty."

The race issue is thus early declared, and maintained with vigor and ability.

ANOTHER CONVENTION.

On the 19th of February, 1868, another Democratic State convention met at Jackson. It represented fully the revolutionary and desperate spirit of the January gathering. A long series of resolutions were adopted, of which the following is a specimen:

"Resolved, That by the constitution and laws of Mississippi white males of the age of twenty-one years and upwards, and citizens of the United States, are alone qualified electors and office-holders, and that no others have a right to vote within the limits of said State, or to hold office therein, and that therefore the acts of Congress prescribing rules whereby negroes are claimed to be authorized to vote or hold office in said State are utterly null and void and of no effect whatever."

Yet in spite of these repeated declarations of the Democratic party of Mississippi, Congressman Lamar had the hardihood to declare, in a speech at Jackson, Mississippi, on the 4th of August, 1875, that "the Government first drew the color line, distinct and deep, by the passage of the reconstruction acts."

The Democratic press teemed with nothing but the most scurrilous and mendacious slanders against all Republicans, and appealed to their readers to treat "all who advocated reconstruction as *enemies and outlaws*."

"A GOOD RESOLUTION."

To show what the spirit was at this time, a portion of an editorial from the *Vicksburg Times*, under the above caption, is given:

"The Democratic Club, of Marion, Alabama, recently adopted unanimously the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the members of this club, in their social intercourse, will not recognize any man as a gentleman, or a friend to his country, who may accept any appointment to office under the reconstruction acts of the Congress of the United States."

"This resolution is good, but it does not go far enough. * * * Between the

white men of the South and the advocates of negro suffrage there should be a deep ditch—a high wall—and these obstacles should be as fixed as fate, and as impassable as the gulf which separated Dives from Lazarus when the former was in hell. They should be made to feel that they are despised outcasts, cut off from all human fellowship and sympathy. * * * Between them and us there can be nothing but hostility, eternal and undying, and there is not a murderer or a thief in the world for whom we have not more respect than we have for the vagabonds who seek to impose negro rule upon the people of the South."

Such was the common sentiment of the press and the stump-speakers at that time. Governor Humphries was the nominee for Governor, and Colonel Charles E. Hooker, at present a member of Congress from the Jackson district, candidate for Attorney General. Both indorsed the White-Line platform, and went far beyond it in their hostile and incendiary declarations.

The election on the new constitution and for State officers occurred on the 22d of June, and for violence, intimidation, and outrage has only been equaled by the high-handed and bloody revolution of 1875. The constitution was voted down by a forced majority of 7,000.

The manner in which that election was carried is thus stated in an address issued by a State convention of Republicans, November 18, 1868:

"Loyal and peaceable citizens were driven from their homes and threatened with violence and death. Public speakers, by threats and intimidations, were prevented from meeting their appointments, or were driven from the stands by lawless mobs. An organization of armed and disguised men, calling itself a Ku-Klux Klan, perambulated the country by night, committing outrages and murders, defying detection. The poor dependent classes of our loyal fellow-citizens were threatened with starvation, discharge from service, and violence and death, if they failed to vote with their disloyal employers. In many counties the state of affairs herein enumerated prevailed to such an extent that there existed not even the semblance of a fair election."

THE ELECTION OF 1869.

Another election on the constitution and for State officers was held in December, 1869. Hon. J. L. Alcorn was the Republican candidate for Governor, and Judge Louis

Dent, a brother-in-law of the President, was the candidate of the Liberals and Democrats. Dent was imported from Washington for the canvass, the Democracy thereby hoping to catch the support of General Grant, but as soon as the trick was discovered the President used all his influence against the attempted fraud, and supported the regular ticket. In like manner, and for the same purpose, the Democracy of Mississippi supported Horace Greeley in 1872. They hoped to accomplish by this means what they had failed to by regular organization under a White-Line banner.

THE KU-KLUX KLAN.

In 1871 a general election occurred in Mississippi for legislative and county officers. The Ku-Klux Klan reorganized early in the spring and began their depredations in that year. Meridian was made the opening theatre of the campaign, and a terrible massacre of colored people ensued. Over thirty school-houses for colored people were burned or destroyed in two months, and a reign of terror, accompanied by murders and outrages, pervaded the State. The enforcement law of Congress was thereupon passed, and over *one thousand* convictions of Ku-Klux took place in the Federal courts at Oxford and Jackson. Comparative peace was thereby restored, and the general elections of 1871, 1872, and 1873 were peaceably and quietly held. The result of those elections was as follows:

| | <i>Rep. maj.</i> |
|------------|------------------|
| 1869 | 38,041 |
| 1871 | 31,006 |
| 1872 | 35,103 |
| 1873 | 20,031 |

Inasmuch as both candidates for Governor in 1873—Ames and Alcorn—were Republicans, the Republican vote was somewhat divided, the body of the party, however, voting for Ames.

THE REVOLUTION OF 1875.

The memorable election of 1875 was the next trial of strength. The canvass opened early, and it soon became evident that the struggle would be fierce and desperate. The time was well chosen by the Democracy. The courts had decided the enforcement law to be unconstitutional, and as they had

no fear of prosecutions under State law, being fully able to intimidate and defy the local officers, they could carry on a campaign of force with impunity. The character and result of that campaign is known to the country and need not be repeated here. Since 1873 it is estimated that the colored vote of the State has increased fully 10,000 by immigration from Georgia, Alabama, and other Democratic States, which they left to escape Democratic oppression. At a fair election the Republican majority in 1875 would not have been less than 45,000. Yet what was the result? The vote for State treasurer was as follows:

| | |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Hemingway, Democrat | 99,211 |
| Buchanan, Republican | 68,225 |
| Democratic majority | 30,986 |

MACHINE POLITICIANS.—The taunt of machine politician, applied to Republican leaders who do not happen to be chosen for us by the Confederate Democracy, has little point and no fitness. Applied to men like Chandler, Morton, and Conkling it is conspicuously senseless. These men have long been prominent in public life. Standing in the open light of the United States Senate for twelve and eighteen years, they have made records which mark the high-water line of American statesmanship, public honor, and personal integrity. No stain smirches the character of either of them. Even Democratic vituperation, that most unclean thing which to-day impeaches Christian civilization, has failed to note the first speck upon their political garments. But they propose to "hold the fort." They decline to strike the flag of Republican principles, of the equal rights of all citizens and equal protection to all; they refuse to throw open the gates of the citadel to the marauding bands without; they are not ready to welcome the blood-stained banditti of the South nor the Tammany thieves of the North to a control of the nation achieved by violence and outrage, or purchased by corruption and fraud. On the contrary, they do not intend that innocent people shall be murdered nor honest voters cheated if they can help it. Hence these tears.

FREE SCHOOLS IN THE SOUTH.

The article in the September number of **THE REPUBLIC** under the above title included the States of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. In pursuance of the line of thought therein presented, and to show what progress, if any, the cause of popular education has made in the reconstructed States since the war, the difficulties encountered in the establishing of free-school systems, and the united and relentless hostility of the Democratic party met in this work, the subject is continued in this number. Attention is next invited to the State of

TEXAS.

Texas was readmitted into the Union by the enabling act of Congress approved February, 1870. The Government then inaugurated was Republican, and the establishment of a system of public instruction was among the first acts passed by the Legislature. October 28, 1871, State Superintendent J. C. De Gress writes that "the system promises to be a success, notwithstanding the prejudice and strong opposition of a large portion of the people." Among the obstacles encountered in the work he enumerates the following:

"At Millican a teacher of a public school cast his vote for the candidate of his choice, and his school was broken up in consequence." * * * * *

"Not long since a teacher of a colored school in Bastrop county was taken from his home at night, tied to a tree, and whipped nearly to death. His school-house was also burned." * * * * *

"It is with great difficulty that houses can be procured for the colored schools in the State, on account of the great opposition to the education of the blacks; and it has been even more difficult to find persons willing to teach such schools, as they have in all cases been ostracised from society."

Concerning the fund arising from the sale of public lands in the State, and dedicated by law to school purposes, in his annual report for 1871, he says:

"This fund, that in 1861 amounted to \$2,592,533.14, became during the war the prey of the enemies of the National Government, and every available portion of it was used by them for furthering their treasonable purposes. \$1,285,327.05 of available

funds were from time to time, during the existence of the rebellion, withdrawn from the school fund and expended; the most of it under the direction of the Military Board." * * * * *

"Out of the thirty-seven States, Texas yet ranks seventh in the possession of a large permanent school fund; this now amounts to \$2,670,798.12."

In 1871 the Legislature of Texas enacted a compulsory school law. It required that all children of suitable age should attend some school for four months in the year.

The sixth report of the agent of the Peabody Fund, made in 1871, contains the following:

"The school fund of Texas, after being sadly plundered, is still larger than that of any Southern State, being \$2,585,297. The whole expenditure for schools in 1871-'72 amounted to \$1,217,101.48."

In his annual report for 1874 the State Superintendent reports that "about 75 per cent. of the scholastic population received four months' tuition in the public schools."

The State of Texas became Democratic by a large and permanent majority in the winter of 1873. The educational condition of the State since that time is shown below in reply to the following letter addressed to the editor of the *Waco Register*, as reproduced, with the editor's reply, in the columns of his paper:

ANSWER TO INQUIRIES.

UNION REPUBLICAN

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE,

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 10, 1876.

W. R. Chase, Esq., Waco, Texas:

DEAR SIR: Will you please inform me what is the exact status of your free-school system under Democratic management?

What does the present law provide for?

What amount of money or taxes is appropriated, and what is the educational condition at this time?

I see you have, or are to have, a new law on this subject.

Did not the Democrats abolish free schools when they came into power?

What is the character of the school-trust fund, and what have they done with it?

I should also like to know what your rate of taxation is and the condition of your finances. Truly, yours,

Editorial.

We have concluded to publish our reply to the above:

1. There are no free schools in the State; at least we are aware of none, either in this section or elsewhere in the State.

2. "The present law" provides for nothing which supports schools. The present law sets apart alternate sections of State public lands to schools, but money is not realized from these, nor expected to be realized, sufficient to support a system of public schools.

3. No money derived from taxation is set apart for schools under the present Democratic administration.

4. Yes, the Democrats abolished free schools when they came into power. We had a good free-school system, and in excellent operation, under our Republican administration, under which the children of the State were being educated. Under our constitution (Republican) all the public lands and one-fourth of the revenues of the State derived from taxation were set apart to schools, and the constitution made it obligatory upon the Legislature to provide free schools for not less than four months in the year.

When the Democrats came in they abolished this constitution, and have put one in its place which sets apart only one-half the public lands to schools, and does not make it obligatory upon the State government to set apart a cent of the money derived from taxes to schools. Under this (Democratic) constitution the public schools have gone down.

5. The school-trust funds were in United States bonds; but the Democratic Legislature has just ordered these bonds to be sold for the money; with which money they will pay themselves for their services, and issue their own (State) depreciated bonds to be put in the place of the United States bonds. The transaction constitutes simply a robbery from the school fund.

6. Taxes have been heavier every year under Democratic administration than they were any year under Republican administration, and have increased from year to year. The rate may be no higher, but more things are taxed.

7. The condition of our State finances is that the legislative finance committee has just reported a deficiency of the rise of \$300,000 of taxes to meet current expenses of the State government. The Comptroller asserts this deficiency to be \$500,000.

The State has been steadily run in debt at the rate of about a million dollars since the present administration came into power.

In May, 1873, the State Legislature (Democratic) abolished the school law which had

been in operation since 1871, and passed another of which the Governor of the State (Republican) says, in declining to approve the act, page 383:

"The constitution (art. 9, sec. 4) directs the Legislature to establish a uniform system of free schools throughout the State; but this act, though in its title it proposes to establish such a system, in reality does away with all systems."

It, however, became a law notwithstanding the opposition of the Governor. And William Alexander, Attorney General of the State, says, (page 384:)

"After a careful study of the school law of May 22, 1873, I am forced to conclude that so many of its provisions are unconstitutional, while others are impracticable, that it cannot be put into operation."

And of its practical effect the State Superintendent says:

"The last Legislature enacted a new school law, repealing the old one, and in effect abolishing our rapidly growing system of common schools. Under this law no uniform system of public free schools, as required by the State constitution, can be established; in fact, the poor, to whom alone the free schools are to be opened, can never under it be educated. * * * In short, the old pauper law of the State is being substantially re-enacted. The school fund is hence likely to be given away to private institutions of learning, while those who are unable to pay for the tuition of their children and are too proud to acknowledge themselves paupers will be deprived of an education solemnly guaranteed to them by the constitution of the State and indorsed by the Congress of the United States.

"The public domain (of the State) on the 31st day of August, 1872, consisted of 88,842,704½ acres of land, the proceeds of which were, by section 6, article 9, of the State constitution, to become a part of the common school fund; but the last Legislature gave away over half of such lands to corporations."

And the Attorney General further says in his official opinion:

"Besides, the Constitution enacts that no law shall ever be made appropriating such (school) fund for any other use or purpose whatever, and the Congress of the United States guaranteed this enactment by providing that the constitution of Texas shall never be so amended or changed as to deprive any citizen or class of citizens of the United States of the school rights and privileges secured by the constitution of said State."

Thirty millions of acres of the large public domain referred to by the State Superintendent above have been donated to Tom Scott's Texas and Pacific railroad. Speaking of this enormous grant the Austin *Statesman* (Democratic) says:

"Scott has gotten all; the Legislature holds its session to suit his ends, and he has been protected in his great land grab, out of which he may, in time, carve States even more pliable than Pennsylvania or Texas. Until the sequel shows it we can hardly believe it, and would ask the public not to foster the idea that Tom Scott is to govern Texas absolutely. That the people can thus be sold out through agencies selected by themselves we will not believe, until a vote is given for President *pro tem.* of the Senate, drawing a distinct line between the friends and opponents of the Texas and Pacific. It is a pitiable spectacle to contemplate, that of Tom Scott wholly controlling the destinies of Texas—making Governors, directing legislation, and even placing a delegation in Congress from Texas purely subservient to his schemes of plunder. It is time for us to ask, in the most serious of moods, *are we free?*"

A late number of the San Antonio *Herald* (Democratic) says:

"In our Legislature the characteristic feature is waste and extravagance. Offices are multiplied, salaries increased, and the people's domain squandered in the most reckless manner; but the sacred trust—the school fund, amounting to \$800,000—committed to their fiduciary care, is also seized and appropriated to the payment of the mileage and per diem and other expenses of this session of the Legislature, and to make good the deficit in the State treasury, caused in part by the expenses incurred for the constitutional convention."

Again, in another issue:

"They are rendering our public free schools a tragic farce; they are sapping its only reliable sources of support by abstracting the United States bonds and squandering the proceeds of their sale. They have robbed you of your princely domain secured by the life-blood of very many and the severest privations of all Texas heroes and veterans. The pittance of a school fund we looked upon as secure as long as we had United States bonds in the treasury for the basis of that fund; but now your fifteenth Legislature, with sacrilegious hands, have torn down the only pillars which could give support to your free-school system. And, in doing so, they have realized that, as Alaric and Attila could invade and devastate the proud and

classic city of Rome, so in this day of boasted refinement and advocacy of universal education a set of Vandals, calling themselves Democrats, of Texas, have violently taken from the childhood and youth of Texas that which is vastly more important to them than bread itself."

SOUTH CAROLINA.

The State of South Carolina has been particularly favored with an advanced and efficient free-school system under continuous Republican rule during the past seven years. Probably no State South has made equal progress, unless it was Mississippi in the four years of effective management by State Superintendent Pease. In South Carolina the organization and development of a free-school system has been steady, progressive, and successful.

In his annual report for 1875 the State superintendent furnishes the following figures:

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Educable children, (white), | 80,461 |
| " " (colored), | 139,395 |

| | |
|-------|---------|
| Total | 219,856 |
|-------|---------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| School attendance, (white), | 47,001 |
| " " (colored), | 63,415 |

| | |
|-------|---------|
| Total | 110,416 |
|-------|---------|

Average monthly wages of teachers, \$30.

Average number of school months, 4½.

Increase of free schools over 1874, 227.

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Total amount of school revenue for the fiscal year ending October 18, 1875 | \$489,542 |
|--|-----------|

| | |
|------------------------------|----------|
| School expenditures for 1868 | \$25,000 |
| " " " 1869 | 112,475 |
| " " " 1870 | 100,735 |
| " " " 1871 | 208,618 |
| " " " 1872 | 420,918 |
| " " " 1873 | 455,317 |
| " " " 1874 | 470,249 |
| " " " 1875 | 434,164 |

The State superintendent, Mr. Jilison, reports that—

"Four main causes check the efficiency and success of our free common schools, and they are—

"1. Want of qualified and efficient teachers.
"2. Inefficiency and unfitness of school officers.

"3. Lack of sufficient interest of the right kind on the part of the people in general.

"4. Inadequacy of means."

Under the third head he says :

"A large and influential class of the community manifest little or no interest in our free schools." * * *

In contrast with the expenditures in the State of South Carolina for free-school purposes he reports :

"The State of Rhode Island, with a school population of 43,800, expended \$668,724 for the support of her common schools during the year 1874. The city of Baltimore expends more money annually for public schools than does the entire State of South Carolina."

NORTH CAROLINA.

The free-school system of North Carolina is very imperfect. The constitution of the State, adopted in 1868 by the Republicans, provides as follows :

"The General Assembly, at its first session under this constitution, shall provide by taxation and otherwise for a general and uniform system of public schools, wherein tuition shall be free of charges to all the children of the State between the ages of six and twenty-one years.

"Each county of the State shall be divided into a convenient number of districts, in which one or more public schools shall be taught at least four months in every year ; and if the county commissioners of any county shall fail to comply with the aforesaid requirements of this section they shall be liable to indictment."

A general system was established as the outgrowth of these provisions, but little progress was made in its organization before the hostile legislation of 1871. In his annual report for 1872 Dr. Sears, agent of the Peabody Fund, reports as follows : "The public mind does not seem to be so well settled here in regard to free schools as in most of the other States. The General Assembly levied no tax for schools for the present year, and the poll-taxes were in many cases applied to other than school purposes."

According to the State superintendent's report for 1874 the sum of \$216,684 was expended for schools in that year.

The number of educable children in the State is 123,088.

The condition of the permanent, educational fund is reported as follows by the State Treasurer, under date of August 25, 1876 :

Educational Fund.

This fund had, before the war, stock as follows, the proceeds of land grants by the General Government :

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Bank of North Carolina..... | \$502,700 |
| Bank of Cape Fear..... | 544,400 |
| Wilmington and Weldon Railroad Company..... | 400,000 |
| Wilmington and Manchester Railroad Company..... | 200,000 |
| Cape Fear Navigation Company..... | 32,500 |
| | 1,679,600 |

The bank stock was lost by the results of the war.

The stock in the two railroads was sold by the Board of Education in April, 1869—that in the Wilmington and Weldon railroad for \$148,000, and that in Wilmington and Manchester railroad for \$10,000. The stock in the Navigation Company was sold for \$3,250 in May, 1869.

Of the amount realized from the sale of the stocks as above stated \$150,000 was invested in \$450,000 of special tax bonds, when that class of bonds was regarded as good. The balance was loaned on good collaterals by order of the Board of Education.

At the close of the war this fund had \$250,000 old bonds which were preserved from the wreck of the war. They were converted into interest-bearing certificates under act of Assembly February 26, 1867, which certificates are now counted among the assets of the fund. Interest was paid to 1868, when it was suspended for want of funds.

The statement (J) on page 43 of the report of Treasurer, 1874, gives a complete record of assets of the Board of Education, to which are to be added \$31,000 to United States bonds, making United States bonds now in possession of board \$76,000.

The Literary Fund had at the close of the war a large amount of Confederate bonds and State war bonds, which were bought with funds accumulating during the war. These funds were of the currency of the country, as then existing.

[SEAL]

D. A. JENKINS,
State Treasurer.

The relation of Republicanism and popular education is not alone ascertained by comparing Republican with Democratic States, but it is apparent also by comparisons between counties in any given State South, if not as well throughout the country. Take, for example, the Republican counties of Wake, Pasquotank, and Granville, and the Democratic counties of Orange, Johnston, and Currituck. Their population and school attendance is as follows :

| | Population. | Attendance. |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Wake..... | 35,617 | 2,956 |
| Orange..... | 17,507 | 783 |
| Granville..... | 24,831 | 1,345 |
| Johnston..... | 16,897 | 747 |
| Pasquotank..... | 8,131 | 1,088 |
| Currituck..... | 5,131 | 121 |

The ratio of attendance in the Republican counties, it will be seen, is much greater than in the Democratic counties. A comparison of all the counties in North Carolina will show that free schools flourish where Republicans rule and languish where Democrats rule.

General Observations.

The following fourteen States are, under ordinary circumstances, conceded to the Republican party: Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wisconsin. The following are conceded, generally, to the Democrats: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia. The remainder are claimed by both parties. They can easily be compared in the light of the last census report:

I. The fourteen Republican States have a population of 16,037,419. The fifteen Democratic States have a population of 12,140,512. In the former the number of public schools is 74,584; in the latter, 22,291. In the former the pupils in public schools are estimated at 3,668,934; in the latter at 1,022,716.

So that the ratio of public schools to population in the Republican States is as 1 to 215, while in the Democratic States it is as 1 to 544, or more than two and a half times as great; and the ratio of attendance upon these schools in the Republican States is as 1 to 41.3, while in the Democratic States it is as 1 to 114.5—nearly three times as great in the former as in the latter. This fact cannot be accounted for on the ground of difference in location, for comparing contiguous States we get the same results; nor on the plea of having been longer in the Union.

Illinois and Missouri are contiguous. The former was admitted a state in 1818 and the latter only three years after.

ILLINOIS.

Illinois has a population of 2,539,891.

MISSOURI.

Missouri has a population of 1,721,295.

The public schools in Illinois number 11,050; pupils, 677,623. The public schools of Missouri number 5,996; pupils, 320,313. In the former the ratio of public schools to population is as 1 to 229; in the latter as 1 to 287. In the former there are in attendance on these schools one pupil to every 34.5 persons; in the latter one to every 51.3.

OHIO AND KENTUCKY.

These States are contiguous. The former was admitted as a State in 1802, the latter ten years earlier.

Ohio has a population of 2,665,260; Kentucky, 1,321,011. The number of public schools in Ohio, 11,458; pupils in schools, 737,693. The number of public schools in Kentucky, 4,727; pupils in schools, 218,240. In the former the ratio of public schools to the population is 1 to 232; in the latter, 1 to 279. In Ohio there are in attendance upon these schools one pupil to every 33.5 persons; in Kentucky, 1 to every 6.

Like results will be obtained by comparing Kansas or Nebraska with Colorado or any other, except, possibly, West Virginia, where the prosperity of the public schools is attributable to other causes than Democratic power.

REFORM CATECHISM.

Q. Who originated the Credit Mobiliery swindle?

A. Samuel J. Tilden.

Q. What lawyer takes fees from both sides?

A. Samuel J. Tilden.

Q. Who swears to false income returns?

A. Samuel J. Tilden.

Q. Who cries "stop thief!" when his confederates are exposed?

A. Samuel J. Tilden.

Q. Who is the fit and proper candidate of the Confederate Democracy?

A. Samuel J. Tilden.

Q. Who is *not* a fit and proper candidate for the support of the American people?

A. Samuel J. Tilden.

The property-holders of the District of Columbia will rue the day when Democracy rules the nation.

TILDEN AND HENDRICKS—A FEW FACTS ABOUT THEIR WAR RECORDS.

Doughface is no misnomer for Northern Democracy. Nor has the appropriateness of the appellation ever been more fully and forcibly demonstrated than is now being done to prove that Samuel J. Tilden was a patriot during the late war. From 1861 to 1865 the Democratic party, as a party, of which Mr. Tilden was a prominent leader, was in open sympathy with the rebels, and the Democratic press teemed with disloyal sentiments, and Democratic conventions, even as late as 1864, adopted resolutions declaring the war a failure. It will be remembered that prominent Democrats of the North met rebel emissaries in Canada, and numerous consultations were there held, in which the heartfelt sympathy of those gentlemen who are now crying "reform" was poured out for their Southern allies and their cause. Their sympathy for the rebels was no secret. Their conventions resolved that such was the fact, their press proclaimed it far and wide, and their opposition to Mr. Lincoln's administration was most bitter, and finally culminated in his assassination. In some of the States, in localities where the Democracy had undisputed control, meetings were held and men enlisted and armed to resist the Government draft to fill our depleted ranks. To such an extent did this opposition prevail that it became necessary to recall troops from the front to take care of the rebel-reform Democracy at home. This is no fiction, but stubborn facts that have already passed into history.

This is the attitude the Democratic party assumed toward the Government at a time when every citizen's aid and sympathy were necessary to preserve the nation's life. It was in 1864, when the fate of the nation was trembling in the balance—the crisis had arrived and every loyal heart was palpitating with anxiety and fear; the Government needed both men and money for the common defense. The old flag was in danger and the dismemberment of the Union seemed almost inevitable. The Government, through her Executive, appealed to her patriotic sons for

aid. It was a time when every loyal citizen was expected to do his duty.

Did the Democracy respond to the appeal? Did they come forth ready "to do and die" for the old flag and the land of their nativity? Be it said to their eternal shame they opposed it—with honorable individual exceptions—to the bitter end; and in the very darkest hours of our nation's peril Samuel J. Tilden, from the Committee on Resolutions in a Democratic National Convention in Chicago, in 1864, brought forth the infamous resolution declaring the war a failure, thus inspiring new hopes and raising new expectations of an ultimate victory in the hearts of the rebels in the South and their cowardly Democratic allies in the North.

Mr. Tilden has a war record which is now, as it always has been, eminently satisfactory to Jeff. Davis and the whole rebel horde, including the Democratic party of the North, whatever other people may think about it. It began in a public way on Saturday, April 20, 1861. On that day the largest mass meeting ever held on this continent was convened in Union square, New York city, to give encouragement to Abraham Lincoln in the opening of the battle for the Union. John A. Dix was the presiding officer, but among the Vice Presidents or speakers were such Democrats as Daniel S. Dickinson, John T. Hoffman, Fernando Wood, Abram S. Hewitt, Erastus Brooks, Augustus Schell, and many others, all whose names were used with their consent. That Samuel J. Tilden did not give any aid to this initial movement in favor of the Union was the fault of no one but himself. He was waited upon by Mr. Samuel Sloan, and asked to allow the use of his name as a Vice President, and curtly refused. Mr. Sloan begged and still Tilden refused to do anything to aid and abet an "abolition war." Mr. Sloan at last lost patience with this obdurate disloyalty and exclaimed, "Mr. Tilden, you will live to regret that you did not do as I asked." Tilden, who already saw Toombs calling the roll of his slaves on Bunker Hill, said, "I think

not," and there the interview ended. The speakers at the meeting which Tilden thus refused to attend were Rev. Dr. Spring, John A. Dix, Daniel S. Dickinson, Senator Baker, of Oregon, Robert J. Walker, Fernando Wood, ex-Governor Hunt, William M. Evarts, Henry J. Raymond, Richard O'Gorman, Hamilton Fish, John Cochrane, David Dudley Field, Royal Phelps, and others. A letter was read from Archbishop Hughes, in which that now deceased and greatly lamented prelate uttered brave, manly, earnest words for the Union, ending by saying: "We know no party now." To the meeting to which the good archbishop wrote, and to which all these patriots spoke, Samuel J. Tilden said, "I have no sympathy with its object."

Mr. Tilden always bore the reputation of being a sly, crafty politician, and his public expressions as to the war were carefully guarded, while his secret heart went out in full sympathy with the rebels. When in private consultation with his Democratic friends he sometimes expressed his sentiments more fully, as will appear from the following extract from a letter of Dr. Russell, correspondent of the *London Times*, concerning a dinner party in New York, in March, 1861. Dr Russell, (afterward known as Bull Run Russell,) writes to the *Times* as follows:

"In the evening, dining again with my friend, the banker, I had a favorable opportunity of hearing more of the special pleading which is brought to bear on the solution of the gravest political questions. It would seem as if a council of physicians were wrangling with each other over abstract dogmas respecting life and health while their patient was struggling in the agonies of death before them. There is not the smallest evidence of uneasiness on account of circumstances which betokened an awful crisis, if not the impending dissolution of society itself. Stranger still, the acts which are bringing about such a calamity were not regarded with disfavor, or at least were not considered unjustifiable. Among the guests were Hon. Horatio Seymour, a former Governor of the State of New York; Mr. Tilden, an acute lawyer, and Mr. Bancroft. The result left on my mind by their conversation and argument, was, that, according to the Constitution, the Government could not employ force to prevent secession, or compel

States which had seceded by the voice of the people to acknowledge the Federal power. In fact, according to them, the Federal Government was the mere machine put forward by a society of sovereign States as a common instrument for certain ministerial acts, more particularly those which affected the external relations of the confederation. * * * There was not a man who maintained that the Government had any power to force the people of a State or to force a State to remain in the Union. Although they admitted the Southern leaders had meditated this treason against the Union, they could not bring themselves to allow their old opponents, the Republicans, now in power, to dispose of the armed force of the Union against their brother Democrats in the Southern States. Although secession will produce rebellion, it was, nevertheless, 'a right' founded on abstract principles, which could scarcely be abrogated consistently with due regard to the original compact. The Democrats behold with silent satisfaction the troubles into which the Republican triumph has plunged the country and are not disposed to extricate them."

It will thus be seen that Mr. Tilden had no sympathy with the North in its efforts to put down the rebellion and preserve the Union, but was actually so thoroughly imbued with the doctrine of States' rights, including the right of secession, that he could not find it in his heart to oppose and resist a dissolution of the Union. Surely the rebels of the South can find no fault with their candidate on that score, and his war record is highly acceptable to them as a matter of course.

It seems Mr. Tilden has "lived to regret" the course he pursued in 1861, or, if not to regret it, to absolutely deny it through his tools in Congress. The effort of Mr. Hewitt to prove Mr. Tilden's loyalty on the floor of the House falls flat when compared with the truth of history, as appears by the following from a highly reliable and authenticated source:

"The statement of Abram S. Hewitt that Samuel J. Tilden subscribed toward the organization of the Tammany regiment during the war is a fabrication out of whole cloth, and Mr. Hewitt should have known that it had no foundation in fact. The documents of the 'Union Defense Committee,' which was started in New York city at the outbreak of the war for the purpose of equipping regiments for active service, show

that the *entire cost* of sending the Tammany and three other New York regiments to the front was defrayed *wholly* by the committee. It was, therefore, unfortunate for Mr. Hewitt to have selected the Tammany regiment as the one to which, as he stated, without the slightest foundation, Mr. Tilden gave a subscription, when the records show that he never gave even one cent to the organization. These facts do not admit of dispute. They have passed into history. The Union Defense Committee of New York, and its action in regard to regiments from that city, are matters of record in the Government offices at Washington. On page 54 of the report of this committee, issued in 1862, we find that they paid out the following sums, being the *whole cost* of equipping the regiments :

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| Tammany Regiment..... | \$47,146 65 |
| Mozart Regiment..... | 67,099 83 |
| Garibaldi Guards..... | 47,517 56 |
| De Kalb Regiment..... | 43,891 50 |

"The average cost of equipping each of these regiments was \$52,997.88. The committee then say :

"These were the only regiments of which the ENTIRE cost was defrayed by the Union Defense Committee. Every article of clothing and equipment was furnished by the committee, together with rations for almost a thousand men each for a period of two months."

"Irrespective of these facts, it was rather unfortunate for Mr. Hewitt to open the 'war record' of Tilden in the House of Representatives. Of the millions of official and other documents published during the war, not one has yet been found showing that Tilden had given counsel or money or a word of encouragement in favor of perpetuating the Union. There is one, however, to be found—one under his own signature—in which he actually proposed to let the South establish an independent nation before a shot was fired—in the hope that she could make a treaty of peace with the North for common defense. Samuel J. Tilden was never known to do anything to help on the war, either by assisting the soldiers themselves or by ministering to their families during their absence or after their deaths. On the contrary, he is known to have refused assistance on many occasions. For the sake of example the following well authenticated case may be stated: Early in the war a young man of excellent family and superior character and attainments was desirous of raising a company. He waited upon Mr. Tilden, with whom he had an acquaintance, and asked him to give him a letter of recommendation to certain State officials.

"Mr. Tilden's reply was in substance as follows: 'Young man, you need not come to

me for any such letter of recommendation; this war is an outrage, and I will lend no assistance whatever to its prosecution.'"

With these facts before us, and they are facts, and we defy refutation, it is left for the intelligent voter to decide for whom he will cast his ballot in November. Every household throughout the length and breadth of this great country have felt the effects of an unholy rebellion with which the Democratic party was in full sympathy, and for which it is alone responsible. Southern soil covers the bones of many, very many, of our noblest and bravest patriots, and the country is filled with limbless and maimed men, whose sacrifices were made that the nation might live. The crutch and the empty sleeve greet us everywhere, and are sad reminders of Democratic rule and of the treasonable purposes of that party, and the part that Samuel J. Tilden took in that war must, when the true historian shall have written the *whole* history of that gigantic rebellion, consign his name to everlasting infamy. The man with the crutch or empty sleeve, as well as the father whose son's remains repose in a Southern grave, either killed in battle or starved in Southern prison-pen, can point to Samuel J. Tilden with unerring certainty and say, as Nathan said to David, "*Thou art the man.*"

It is unnecessary to occupy much space in ventilating the war record of Thomas A. Hendricks. It is a generally admitted fact that he was a major general in the infamous order of Knights of the Golden Circle, an organization which had for its object the promoting of the cause of the rebels and an organized opposition to the war policy of the Federal Government. Mr. Hendricks, like Mr. Tilden, is now endeavoring to prove his loyalty to his country during the rebellion, but, in the light of established facts, finds it extremely difficult to satisfy the people upon this important question. It is indeed a sad commentary upon the Democracy of this country that it becomes necessary for men who aspire to the highest offices in the gift of the people to be obliged to attempt to prove their loyalty to the Government which they aspire to rule. It is in striking con-

trast with that of the Republican candidates, Messrs. Hayes and Wheeler, to whose war records every loyal person can point with pride. They cannot be assailed—their reputations are above suspicion.

We cannot better illustrate Mr. Hendricks' position on the war question than by quoting from his speech at Shelbyville, Indiana, delivered February 5, 1863, in which he declared he had never advised any one to enlist in the Union army because he did not intend to enlist himself. In discussing the authority of the General Government to arrest deserters he said :

"If any young men have left their companies to come home without authority they have done an unfortunate thing, because they have not acted in accordance with law. So that you cannot fight the battle at issue in your neighborhoods. You must act in accordance with law. *If anybody, however, comes into your neighborhoods without law, and propose to take anybody away by force, that is a matter without law, and you had best attend to that, gentlemen, at once.*" [Shouts of "We'll attend to them, old fellow!"]

In the same speech he announced his readiness to compromise with the rebels in the following language :

"What the next two years will bring about I do not know. There is one course for us to pursue, and that is to do our duty. I have hopes that this war will not last very much longer, and that there will be some adjustment consistent with the honor of the Government and the Union of the States. *I am ready to compromise at any time. I am ready to say to the people of the South, 'Come in again and we will secure to you your constitutional rights, and, if you desire them, additional guarantees.'* If there is any man who desires to continue fighting and spending the people's money and lives I do not sympathize with him. I should like to see these States brought together in convention again, and settle upon a mode of adjustment. I do not know whether we have a Government that will do it or not."

As late as September 14, 1864, less than a year before the close of the war, but at the very darkest period of the rebellion, Mr. Hendricks was announced to address a Democratic mass-meeting at Seymour, Indiana. The following is a literal copy of the handbill circulated to call the "faithful" together :

DEMOCRATIC MASS-MEETING.

HON. THOMAS A. HENDRICKS

Will Address the People of Jackson and Adjoining Counties at

SEYMOUR, IND.,

ON WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 14, 1864, AT 10 O'CLOCK.

Let all who FAVOR PEACE, all who desire to be FREE from the death-grip of this infamously wicked, imbecile, and tyrannical Administration, its arbitrary and illegal arrests, and its drafts and conscription laws, by which peaceful citizens are dragged from their homes and all the endearments of domestic life, to butcher and be butchered, COME OUT and hear this advocate of peace and reunion. Come in wagons, come on horseback, come by railroad and on foot. Bring your neighbors, and especially your Republican neighbors, who are seeking for the truth. Bring your baskets well filled with something to eat. Other able speakers will be in attendance. Ladies especially invited. If possible, arrangements will be made with railroads to carry at HALF FARE.

AUGUST 29, 1864.

These extracts might be multiplied indefinitely, but the foregoing is enough of the sickening records of Tilden and Hendricks. They are, however, representative men of the party that placed them in nomination, and should they be elected the rebels could ask no greater boon.

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.—If "civil service reform" means a school-boy catechism for men it is a practical absurdity.

If it means giving the control of the administration of public affairs to the enemies of the Government on their pretense of "non-partisanship," it is a public crime.

If it means appointments at the will of the Executive without consultation with or recommendation by the chosen representatives of the people, it is contrary to a republican theory of government.

If it means defalcations, contract swindles, and public peculations of all kinds, the Democratic Administrations which preceded and which fomented the late war have given the country enough of it to last the remainder of the century.

If it means competent men in public position, fidelity to public trusts, a steady improvement in administrative methods, and a wise and prudent economy in public disbursements, the Republican Administrations since 1861 may proudly challenge a comparison with the very best of earlier or later periods.

SOUTHERN STATE GOVERNMENTS—THEIR FINANCIAL CONDITION CONSIDERED.

Much has been said and written about the corruption and profligacy of what are derisively termed the "carpet-bag governments" of the South. It is the design of this article to show their actual financial condition at this time, and the extent to which financial embarrassment and distress, if it does exist, is attributable to Republican administration.

The following table shows the number of miles of railroad constructed in the United States each year, as follows:

| | |
|------|-------|
| 1865 | 1,177 |
| 1866 | 1,742 |
| 1867 | 2,449 |
| 1868 | 2,979 |
| 1869 | 5,118 |
| 1870 | 5,528 |
| 1871 | 7,779 |
| 1872 | 6,427 |
| 1873 | 3,948 |
| 1874 | 1,960 |
| 1875 | 2,008 |

In the flush times following the war, when money was plenty and the railroad fever very generally pervaded the country, the Southern States shared in the spirit of mingled speculation and enterprise. Vast areas of territory, comprising fertile and productive lands, lay many miles from rail or river communication, and were inaccessible to ready and easy markets. All their industries were prostrate and a general feeling of gloom and despondency had settled over the country.

Reconstruction under Republican auspices was generally regarded as the inauguration of a new era, in which the hope of returning prosperity, accompanied with the spirit and enterprise that characterized the North and the West, was to be speedily realized. The States of Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska were extending liberal aid to internal improvements, and why could not the South do the same? Her needs were equally great, and her ability equally good. Republicans and Democrats alike shared this prevailing sentiment, and the person who declared against it was denounced as a "fogy" and ignored in the counsels of the people.

This rage for railroad building, supported by State, county, and municipal authority,

possessed every State in the South for several years before the crisis of 1873, and may be said to have been universally popular. But the panic brought a total change of sentiment, and suddenly, in the collapse that followed, the very liberal donations that had been extended to these enterprises by the concurrence of both parties were charged back upon the Republicans as extravagant and corrupt schemes that deserved to be repudiated and denounced by every good citizen. This, too, notwithstanding the well known fact that Democrats had been most urgent and officious in asking for such aid, invariably voted for it in the legislature, and were almost the sole beneficiaries, as is shown in the State of North Carolina.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Ante and post war debt of North Carolina, as reported by the Public Treasurer, October 1, 1866.....\$13,033,000 00

Interest on said debt at 6 per cent. to July 1, 1868, at which date the new State government, under the reconstruction acts, was organized.....1,368,463 00

Total legal debt at the period of reconstruction.....14,401,463 00

Amount of State debt as stated by Governor Holden in his message to the Legislature, dated November 17, 1868, the debt dating October 1, 1868.....19,209,945 00

Amount of State debt on October 1, 1869, as stated in Governor Holden's message to the Legislature, dated November 18, 1869.....29,815,045 00

Total recognized debt, as reported by Public Treasurer under date of November 21, 1870, debt dating to October 1, 1870, including interest due and unpaid.....31,640,771 75

Total debt, as stated by Governor Caldwell in message, under date November 20, 1871, debt running to October 1, 1871.....34,887,464 45

Total debt, as stated by Governor Caldwell in message, under date of November 18, 1872, as "nearly thirty seven millions".....37,000,000 00

Total debt, as stated by Governor Caldwell in message, under date November 17, 1873, as over "thirty-eight millions".....38,000,000 00

Total debt, as stated by Governor Brogden in message of November 16, 1874, debt dating to October 1, 1874.....38,921,848 05

The interest on the aforesaid debt at 6 per cent. from October 1, 1874, to October 1, 1876, amounts to.....4,670,621 76

Which added to debt as stated by Governor Brogden in his message of November 16, 1874.....38,921,848 05

Leaves the total debt, October 1, 1876.....43,592,469 81

COMMENTS.

It will be seen that a large portion of the present legal debt is the accumulative interest since 1869. The additions to the ante-war debt were made—

1. During the war for internal improvements.

2. Between 1865 and 1867, by the convention and the Provisional Legislature, under Johnson's reconstruction.

3. By the convention of 1867-'68, held under the reconstruction acts, and the legislation of 1868-'69.

Of course it will be seen that the debt reported October 1, 1866, was created by the Democrats before, during, and after the war, and hence the Republicans found on the 1st of July, 1868, on assuming control of the government, an old debt, in which they had no responsibility in creating, of \$14,401,465. The additions made to these State obligations by the constitutional convention of 1867 and 1868, and the Legislature of 1868-'69, were as follows:

Railroad Indorsements.

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Chatham railroad..... | \$3,200,000 |
| Williamstown and Tarboro' railroad..... | 500,000 |
| W. C. and R. railroad..... | 3,000,000 |
| Western North Carolina railroad..... | 6,666,000 |
| Atlantic and T. railroad..... | 2,000,000 |
| Western railroad..... | 1,500,000 |
| N. W. N. C. railroad..... | 1,440,000 |
| Total..... | 18,356,000 |

Not all these bonds were issued, some having been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, others having been retained for interest, and others voluntarily returned. But the increase of the debt arose from those issues. It is a fact well known, and not disputed in North Carolina, that *in every case where bonds were asked for it was by Democrats in every instance, with the exception of two; the bonds were issued to Democrats who were presidents of railroads.*

The Democrats voted for them uniformly in the Legislature. The Legislature was constantly surrounded by Democratic lawyers, (attorneys for these roads,) such as Bragg, Vance, Davis, Merrimon, Ransom, and most of the leading Democratic lawyers of the State.

The issues authorized to be delivered to Democrats were as follows:

| | |
|--|-------------|
| R. H. Cowan, president W. C. and R. railroad..... | \$2,000,000 |
| W. Y. Hawkins, president R. and G. railroad..... | 3,200,000 |
| G. W. Swyson, president W. N. C. railroad..... | 6,666,000 |
| William Johnson, president A. and T. railroad..... | 2,000,000 |
| E. Belt, president N. W. N. C. railroad..... | 1,440,000 |
| J. K. Stubbs, president W. and Y. railroad..... | 550,000 |
| A. J. Jones, president W. R. railroad..... | 1,500,000 |
| W. Sloan, president W. C. and R. railroad..... | 2,000,000 |
| Total..... | 19,356,000 |

The Democrats were most strenuous in advocating the issue of bonds. They received all but \$3,500,000. If there was any mismanagement of the liberal aid thus extended by the State *the Democracy is the responsible party.*

EFFECT OF THE CONFEDERATE POLICY.

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Confederate State debt, as reported by State Treasurer October 1, 1866 (this debt was contracted by the State during the rebellion)..... | \$18,117,836 25 |
| Interest at 8 per cent. on above from October 1, 1866, to October 1, 1876, would be..... | 14,494,269 00 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Total Confederate debt to October 1, 1876..... | 32,612,105 25 |
|--|---------------|

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Add the <i>ante</i> and <i>post</i> war debt, as reported above, October 1, 1866, and interest to October 1, 1876, and the total would be..... | 20,852,800 00 |
| If the Confederate or Democratic policy had obtained the debt would be, therefore, on October 1, 1876..... | 53,464,905 25 |

Or nearly ten millions in excess of the present debt of the State.

COMMENTS.

It will be remembered that the Confederate State debt was annulled by a vote of the constitutional convention of 1865. But that body had persistently refused to pass this act until President Johnson sent a telegram to the president of the convention to the effect that the State government could not be recognized unless the debt was repudiated. The telegram created the utmost indignation in the convention and among the people. Mr. Moore, an old and eminent lawyer, held the floor when the message from the President was received. He was proceeding to denounce it, when the flag upon the dome of the Capitol fell with a crash which startled everybody. Mr. Moore, with great vehemence, exclaimed, "Well may that flag drop from the dome of this Capitol when we are insulted by this exhibition of tyranny!"

This may be taken as an index of public opinion on the question of repudiating the Confederate debt. There is not a shadow of doubt that if the old ruling population—the Democrats—had been left to themselves that debt would have been to-day incorporated with the State debt. And the best possible evidence that they would have increased these new obligations is, that, without exception, they were instigated by them, voted for by them, and in a large measure appropriated to their use. So that we may conclude that if the Democratic policy had obtained throughout the State would have been encumbered with all the *ante* war and *post* war debt. Also with the Confederate war debt, amounting to the enormous sum of \$76,204,574.96, which is the sum of the present State debt and the Confederate debt included.

It is the common clamor of ex-Confederate or Democratic orators and newspaper editors that the people are oppressed by enormous taxes. The taxes in North Carolina are not heavy. Why should they be? The State is paying nothing but the current expenses of its government. On the credits which have been issued the Commonwealth has realized not less than \$25,000,000 in current funds. They have paid no interest, and have taken no steps toward making a sinking fund for the principal. How have they lost anything as a body politic? They are continually enjoying the benefits of the \$25,000,000 realized on the sale of their bonds, and of course the treasury is richer to that amount.

It must be remembered also that in North Carolina the Governor has no veto power, and as the Legislature has been overwhelmingly Democratic since 1871 the Democratic party must be held responsible for the accumulating indebtedness as well as for the large increase during the few years of Republican rule.

ARKANSAS.

In 1837, 1838, and 1840, when the State was under Democratic rule, its bonds were issued for a large amount, and the interest on these bonds was never paid. In 1868, when the Republicans took control, they knew that to establish the credit of the State it was ne-

cessary that it should be honest, and it added the unpaid interest to these bonds, took them up and issued new ones, amounting altogether to \$3,910,000. This sum is clearly chargeable to the *ante-bellum* Democrats. The States never received any benefit from the money, for the officials who had it in charge stole it. It was borrowed for the State and the Real Estate Bank, and was given to Democratic politicians who pretended to give mortgages on their fine plantations, but instead of doing so gave them on worthless land. On this debt the Republicans paid the interest until the Democrats came into power; since that time \$2,045,000 of interest has accrued and is unpaid. This is also chargeable to the Democrats, and makes this item \$5,955,000.

The Republican Legislature provided for a loan of the State's credit to assist in building railroads. They guarded the State's interest by inserting a clause in the law that any railroad, in default of the interest on the bonds loaned it by the State, should be seized by the State treasurer, placed in the hands of a receiver, and all the moneys accruing should be used to pay the interest on the bonds. Under this law bonds to the amount of \$5,350,000 were issued to five railroads. The interest on these bonds was paid by the roads until 1872, when, failing to pay, they were all seized by the Republican State treasurer and put in the hands of receivers. The first Democratic Legislature repealed that section of the "railroad aid law" by which the State treasurer could sequester the roads, they were all released from the receivers, and the bonds which were issued as a loan, the State being amply secured by the Republicans, were made a gift by the Democrats to the railroads. The unpaid interest on these bonds amounts to \$1,418,000. This sum added to the principal makes \$6,768,000, also chargeable to the Democrats. In 1874, during the Brooks-Baxter war, bonds bearing ten per cent. interest were issued by the Democrats, and these now amount to \$303,000. The Democratic Legislature of 1875 authorized the issue of \$2,500,000 worth of bonds, and of these \$256,000 have been issued. This makes a total of \$13,282,000 of the bonds of the State. It includes every dollar of its bonded indebtedness, and

the Democrats before and since the war are responsible for every dollar of it.

There were three million dollars of levee bonds issued by the State under Republican rule, but they were not a State bond, were secured on the swamp lands, were receivable for swamp lands, and more than one-third of them have been paid in these lands, and all will be.

The floating debt of the State when it passed under Democratic rule was about \$1,500,000 in State scrip bearing five per cent. interest. This debt was made in 1868 and 1869. In those years the Ku-Klux undertook to rule the State. Senator Powell Clayton was then Governor, and he called out the militia and *put them down*. The calling out of the State forces made this expenditure, and so it may be fairly charged to the Democrats, for had it not been for their action the militia would not have been needed.

Arkansas was four and a half years under Republican rule, Clayton and Hadley being Governors. It has been four years under Democratic rule, Baxter and Garland being Governors, for though Baxter was elected as a Republican he went over to the Democrats immediately after getting into power. A comparison of expenses during these periods would not be amiss, and will show clearly what the people of the State lost by the transfer. Under Clayton and Hadley, for four and a half years, the Governor's office cost \$80,089.63. Under Baxter and Garland for four years it cost \$146,746. The office of Secretary of State cost under Clayton and Hadley \$28,719.04; under Baxter and Garland \$49,125.83. The Treasurer's office under Clayton and Hadley cost \$63,593.09; under Baxter and Garland it cost \$101,178.79. Under Clayton and Hadley the Auditor's office cost \$90,975.90; under Baxter and Garland it cost \$223,395.83. The office of Internal Improvement Commissioner cost under Clayton and Hadley \$35,045.14; under Baxter \$28,102.90, and was abolished under Garland. The office of State Land Commissioner under the Republicans cost \$44,525.09; under the Democrats it cost \$78,888.66. The office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction cost under Clayton and Hadley \$155,860.07. In the first few months of Baxter's adminis-

tration it cost \$35,000, and was then abolished, county superintendents being substituted. Under Garland it cost \$1,800 per annum, and the schools show even a less per centage under him than the expenditures.

Under the Republicans the courts cost \$316,648.80; under the Democrats \$340,203.24, and there are fewer judges. The Legislatures under the Republicans cost \$457,815.27; under the Democrats they cost \$630,102.27. These figures are given for four and a half years of Republican rule and four years of Democratic rule, and they add up for the Republicans \$1,273,273.00, and for the Democrats \$1,635,343.52. Such is the saving effected in Arkansas by Democratic rule, and this sum does not include \$58,000 of the school fund for which the first Democratic treasurer, now a prominent candidate for Congress, was a defaulter.

MISSISSIPPI.

The State of Mississippi has been singularly fortunate in her financial management since Congressional reconstruction. The constitutional convention of 1868 inserted a clause in the constitution prohibiting the Legislature from "loaning the credit of the State to any individual or corporation." Under the proclamation of the President, in 1869, when the second election on the adoption of the constitution occurred, this clause was set apart with others for a separate vote. The Republicans voted unanimously to retain it in the constitution, and about half the Democrats voted to strike it out.

The effect of this Republican restriction has been to entirely prevent the Legislature from indorsing railroad bonds, or otherwise pledging the credit of the State to private or public enterprises, so that not a dollar of indebtedness has been incurred in this way. The State has had no "jobs," such as have characterized some of the other States North and South.

The financial condition of Mississippi can be ascertained by the following table, compiled from the official records, comparing twenty years of Democratic rule, before and since the war, with six years of Republican rule:

| EXPENDITURES. | | | |
|---|----------------|-----------|---------------|
| 1850..... | \$265,933 48 | 1860..... | \$663,536 55 |
| 1851..... | 226,407 41 | 1861..... | 1,824,161 75 |
| 1852..... | 892,679 76 | 1862..... | 6,819,894 54 |
| 1853..... | 249,888 45 | 1863..... | 2,210,794 23 |
| 1854..... | 584,296 84 | 1864..... | 5,446,732 06 |
| 1855..... | 311,578 19 | 1865..... | 1,410,250 13 |
| 1856..... | 784,896 79 | 1866..... | 1,860,809 88 |
| 1857..... | 1,067,086 57 | 1867..... | 625,817 29 |
| 1858..... | 614,659 00 | 1868..... | 525,78 80 |
| 1859..... | 707,015 00 | 1869..... | 463,219 71 |
| | 5,923,741 49 | | 20,208,894 95 |
| | | | 5,623,741 49 |
| Total expenditures for twenty years..... | | | |
| 25,832,643 44 | | | |
| Now take the Republican administration for six years. Expenditures for— | | | |
| 1870..... | \$1,031,249 98 | 1873..... | \$953,030 00 |
| 1871..... | 1,319,626 19 | 1874..... | 908,330 00 |
| 1872..... | 1,098,031 69 | 1875..... | 618,259 00 |
| | 3,478,906 78 | | 2,479,619 00 |
| | | | 3,478,906 78 |
| | | | 5,957,525 78 |

The total expenditures for six years, \$5,957,525.78.

The twenty years of Democratic administration show an annual average of \$1,291,632.32. The six years of Republican administration show an annual average of \$992,920.96.

This may be claimed to be unfair, as it embraces four years of the war; but, for the sake of fairness, let us strike out the four years of the war, or the amount expended during those four years, 1861, 1862, 1863, and 1864, and add in lieu thereof the amount expended in 1860, \$663,536.55, and we have an expenditure of \$12,184,019.06, or an annual average of \$699,200.95, as against \$992,920.96. From this it would appear that the Republican administration has been more expensive than the Democratic administration; but there are several reasons for this: Before the war the taxes were paid in gold and silver, and everything much cheaper than since the war; and in January, 1870, when the Republicans came into power, the State warrants were worth about sixty or sixty-five cents on the dollar; the capitol and mansion were dilapidated; the penitentiary and lunatic asylum were too small, and had to be extended and repaired, and all the improvements cost nearly two prices, because payments were made in warrants at their reduced value. And the judiciary system was rendered more expensive to the State by dispensing with the probate

court, the expenses of which had been formerly paid by the counties; this jurisdiction was given to the chancery court, and the number of citizens had more than doubled, and all departments of State government rendered necessarily more expensive. And again, the school system has been carried on at an expense very large, a thing that had never existed before the war. The expenditures for school purposes in the six years have been about \$320,000 per annum. Let us add a few items which have been necessary since the war, and for which no expenditures were ever made by the Democracy, by way of annual averages, and it will be seen at a glance why it is that the expenditures have been larger than formerly:

EXTRAORDINARY EXPENDITURES.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| For school purposes, (as above)..... | \$320,000 |
| Probate court business by the chancery court, (probate salaries by the counties,) Code, 1857, (p. 423)..... | 36,700 |
| Average annual improvements on public buildings, about..... | 100,000 |
| County records, &c., furnished, destroyed during the war, and exhausted, &c..... | 12,500 |
| Making an average per annum of..... | 469,200 |

Taking this from the average, \$992,920.96, leaves \$523,720.96. These were necessary expenses, never incurred by a Democratic administration. The only common-school system in the State before the war seemed to be a well-organized system to squander the school fund of the State as rapidly as the same was donated by the Government, as the history of the fund will show. Take these items from the annual expenditures of the six years of Republican administration, and the average is reduced per year to \$523,720.96; thus showing the average annual expense of the Republican administration to be, on the old basis of State expenses, actually \$75,480 less than the average expenses under the Democratic rule of twenty years, with less than one-half of the citizens to be governed, and at a time when expenditures everywhere were largely in advance of former years. Many other items of extraordinary expenses have been incurred since January, 1870, not included in these statements.

REPUBLICAN TAXATION.

The taxes have been increased and decreased for the various State purposes, for the

six years alluded to, as follows: 1870, 5 mills on the dollar; 1871, it was 4 mills; in 1872, $8\frac{1}{2}$ mills; in 1873, it was $12\frac{1}{2}$; in 1874, it was 14 mills; in 1875, it was $9\frac{1}{4}$ mills. In the last three years there was a school tax as follows: 1873 and 1874, a school tax of 4 mills, and for 1875, 2 mills. This is included in the above estimate, and the counties were restricted in their levies for county purposes as follows: By act of 1872 the counties were prohibited from levying a tax which, with the State and school tax added, shall not exceed 25 mills on the dollar, and in 1875 they were restricted to 20 mills on the dollar.

DEMOCRATIC TAXATION.

The recent Democratic Legislature fixed the limit of taxation, State and county, (no township taxes are assessed in Mississippi,) at $16\frac{1}{2}$ mills, but it cut off the two mills State tax for schools, and has so reduced the limit that in nearly every instance county taxes for schools will also be omitted, the assessments being devoted entirely to general purposes. Thus, the only effect of Democratic "retrenchment and reform" in Mississippi is the virtual destruction of the free school system.

STATE DEBT.

According to the annual message of Governor Ames, delivered the 3d of January, 1876, the entire State indebtedness of Mississippi, bonded and floating, was only five hundred thousand dollars.

RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS.

The receipts over disbursements for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1875, were \$496,000.

A SOUND CONDITION.

Never before in the history of Mississippi were the State finances in a more healthy condition than during the last year of Governor Ames' administration. Warrants on the treasury were near par for the first time in twenty years; the interest on the small bonded debt was promptly paid, and the debt itself discharged at maturity.

TAXATION COMPARED WITH OTHER STATES.

To show that there was no ground for complaint on the score of heavy taxes in Mississippi, the following table is presented as compiled from the census of 1870:

New York:

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Assessed value of property..... | \$1,967,001,185 |
| Total taxes..... | 48,550,308 |
| Rate of taxation, 2 46-10 per cent on the dollar. | |

Ohio:

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Assessed value of property..... | \$1,167,731,697 |
| Total taxes..... | 23,526,548 |
| Rate of taxation, 2 01 per cent. on the dollar. | |

Illinois:

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Assessed value of property..... | \$482,890,575 |
| Total taxes..... | 21,825,008 |
| Rate of taxation, 4 5 per cent. on the dollar. | |

Indiana:

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Assessed value of property..... | \$663,455,014 |
| Total taxes..... | 10,791,121 |
| Rate of taxation, 1 6 2-10 per cent. on the dollar. | |

Massachusetts:

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Assessed value of property..... | \$1,501,983,112 |
| Total taxes..... | 24,922,900 |
| Rate of taxation, 1 5 9-10 per cent. on the dollar. | |

Missouri:

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Assessed value of property..... | \$556,129,969 |
| Total taxes..... | 3,008,493 |
| Rate of taxation, 2 5 per cent. on the dollar. | |

Michigan:

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Assessed value of property..... | \$272,242,917 |
| Total taxes..... | 5,412,937 |
| Rate of taxation, 1 9 per cent. on the dollar. | |

Pennsylvania:

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Assessed value of property..... | \$1,313,238,042 |
| Total taxes..... | 24,531,397 |
| Rate of taxation, 1 8 8-10 per cent. on the dollar. | |

The average rate of the above States is 2 1 5-10 per cent. on the dollar.

TEXAS.

The State of Texas passed under complete Democratic rule in January, 1874, although for two years previous the Legislature had been overwhelmingly Democratic. Practically the Democrats have controlled the State since January, 1872.

STATE DEBT.

On the 10th of February, 1874, the State Auditor reported the State debt to be \$1,748,831.75. On the 1st of last February he reported the debt at \$4,792,804.84, showing an increase under Democratic administration of \$3,044,023.09.

Auditor Darden further reports that the debt of the State increased during the fiscal year ending January 31, 1876, the sum of \$780,473.63.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.

The receipts from taxes in the last fiscal year were \$2,127,495.23; yet at the expiration of that year, notwithstanding the heavy receipts, there were outstanding \$543,137.54 in warrants on the treasury, with no money to pay the same, showing the actual expenditures of the State to have been \$2,770,633.07.

A CONTRAST.

Under the administration of Governor Davis, Republican, who was forced out of

office by the Democrats in January, 1874, a year before his time really expired, when the public schools were liberally supported and the State police were organized to preserve the peace, the total receipts were but \$625,600.41, a fraction over one-fourth expended by Governor Coke, his immediate successor.

Mr. W. R. Chase, editor of the *Waco Register*, of date July 17th, writes as follows:

"Taxes have been heavier every year under Democratic administration than they were any year under Republican administration, and have increased from year to year. The rate may be no higher but more things are taxed.

"The condition of our State finances is that the legislative finance committee has just reported a deficiency of the rise of \$300,000 of taxes to meet current expenses of the State government. The Comptroller asserts this deficiency to be \$500,000. The State has been steadily run in debt at the rate of about a million of dollars a year since the present administration came into power."

EXTRAVAGANCE AND BANKRUPTCY.

The *San Antonio Herald*, an outspoken Democratic paper, says:

"We are cursed with a Legislature, one of a series, which, by its majorities, in spite of the beneficence of Providence, ground us down with the iron heel of oppression, have piled taxes Ossa upon Pelion high, and but partially and imperfectly executed the very laws they themselves enacted. They have run the expenditures of the State from a couple of hundred thousand dollars a year into millions; they, in their expenditures, have exceeded the revenues of the State, and instead of reforming this condition of affairs to a healthy condition by retrenching all expenses to the actual income of the State, they are to-day issuing bonds to make good the deficiencies in the treasury, which, when sold for what they may bring in the market, with all the tawdry appendages of commissioners to sell, and commissions and other expenses, running into the hundred thousands of dollars, will be met by the project to issue other batches of bonds to provide for the emergency to pay the principal and interest of the bonds now issued. In the meantime they place their sacrilegious hands upon every actual dollar and cash assets in the treasury, as the special school fund, which should be a secure fund, and this they squander to bridge over what the Legislature deems an emergency."

BROKEN PROMISES.

The *San Marcos Free Press*, another Dem-

ocratic paper, calls on Governor Coke to resign, and sums up his broken promises in this style:

"You promised you would have the finances of the State on a specie basis in one hundred days; we all know how truthful that has been. You promised to suppress crime in the country, and you have vetoed every bill of the Legislature that tended in that way. You recommended the new constitution to the people as the best we ever had, and in your first message you recommended amendments enough to make a constitution within themselves. You were elected because of your opposition to railroad monopolies, and you have been aiding and abetting a party in the Legislature to steal land and territory enough to make a State as large as Tennessee."

Says the *Austin Statesman* (Democratic) of August 18, 1876:

"Comptroller Darden makes the open assertion, and he has published it in his official reports, that the present revenues are insufficient to meet the expenses of government, and, according to his theory, and it is a correct one, taxes must either be raised or bonds sold to prevent evidences of State indebtedness from being hawked at disgraceful figures. The matter of selling bonds, or making an interest-bearing debt to pay a non-interest bearing debt, is, to use a vulgarism, 'too thin.' Within the last few years a large amount of debt has been paid in this way, and the work still goes on. Nearly five millions of dollars is now the measure of the State's bonded indebtedness, and if the Executive and law-makers do not meet the issue bravely, in five years more it will be twice that amount."

A DISGRACEFUL EXPEDIENT.

The climax of Democratic imbecility was reached on the 25th of August last, when they passed a bill through the Legislature compelling the poor men of the State to make good their delinquencies by paying a capitation tax. Of this act the *Austin State Gazette* (Democratic) says:

"The Legislature adjourned yesterday at 12 m., and without passing an act for imposing an additional tax of fifteen cents, recommended by the finance committees to meet the deficit exhibited in the current expenses of the government. In lieu of this a tax of one dollar per capita was imposed on every suffragan of the State, in the vain expectation of realizing a sufficient amount to answer the purposes of government.

"But the subterfuge of a per capita tax will not answer the purpose. It is doubtful whether one hundred thousand dollars can

be raised from this source; and if it could, it only amounts to one-fourth of what is needed to honor the floating debt of the State. It is, besides, predicated on a false principle, practically taxing the poor for the benefit of the rich. As matters now stand treasury warrants will depreciate to such an extent as to force the resignation of some of the best county and district officers. Meantime the honest creditors of the State will suffer heavy losses from depreciated State paper, and brokers will coin their gains from false legislation."

PROFLIGACY AND PLUNDER.

Of all the States in the South Texas has become most notorious for reckless and extravagant legislation. Its record for corrupt jobbery cannot be surpassed. The first Democratic assembly after reconstruction, in a single act, donated over *thirty millions of acres of public lands* to Tom Scott's railroad, and robbed the school fund of the State of that amount.

GEORGIA.

| | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|
| 1860—State debt..... | \$3,170,750 |
| 1865—State debt, (old)..... | \$5,706,500 |
| Rebel debt..... | 15,104,726 |
| Total | 20,811,226 |
| 1868—State debt..... | \$6,544,500 |
| 1872—State debt..... | 8,618,750 |
| 1875—State debt, January 1..... | 8,105,500 |

In 1868, when the reconstructed government was inaugurated, the rebel debt had been repudiated, and the recognized debt was \$6,544,500.

RAILROAD DEBT.

The contingent liabilities for railroads for bonds indorsed are stated by Governor Conley in his message of January 11, 1872, at \$7,083,400. The Governor further states that on December 2, 1871, railroads had complied with and were entitled to indorsement, and loans on bonds amounting, when the roads are completed, to \$7,029,500. In conclusion, he adds: "If all roads building under the law of December 2, 1871, be completed, the entire indorsement will be \$9,533,900."

The State reserves the first lien, with power to seize and sell the road on failure to pay the interest or principal.

HOW AID WAS GRANTED.

The aid is granted at an average rate of \$13,000 per mile on completed sections of

twenty miles, but in no case to exceed one-half the actual cost of the road invested by the company. Governor Conley, in his letter of December 2, 1871, says:

"The contingent liability of the State is as indorser of the bonds of certain railroads. This liability has been contracted since 1868, and the State, by her legislation, may be said to have adopted a general system of internal improvements by granting the loan of her indorsement to railroads in the course of construction, and after they had built and equipped a certain number of miles. This indorsement of railroad bonds is restricted by article 3, section 6, of the constitution of the State, viz: 'The General Assembly shall pass no law making the State a stockholder in a corporate company without a provision that the whole property of the company shall be bound for the security of the State prior to any other debt or lien, except to laborers, nor to any company in which there is not already an equal amount invested by private persons; nor for any other object than a work of public improvement.' In all indorsements of bonds of railroads by the State the roads seeking the indorsement have first placed themselves within this provision of the constitution, and in no case has the indorsement of the State been granted for a greater amount than one-half the estimated cost per mile of the road when completed and equipped."

BOTH PARTIES RESPONSIBLE.

The acts conferring this aid were passed by the votes of members of both political parties, as the records show, and the State is considered secure against any loss or expense on this account if the law be properly enforced.

TAXABLE PROPERTY INCREASED.

Upon the other hand, it is conceded that the value of taxable property has been greatly enhanced in the vicinity of these roads. The Georgia Air-line may be given as an example. It is shown by the Superintendent of Public Works in 1871 that the aggregate value of property through which this road passes, in a single year, increased \$2,582,980, and since the road was begun the increase had been \$4,742,821.

The three counties through which the Marietta and Western road passes show an increase of value in a single year of \$400,000. The three counties along the South Georgia and Florida road an increase from 1868 to 1870 of \$1,265,472. Equal or greater advantage to property has been realized along

other new lines subsidized by the State. It is further shown that the total increase along the ten lines thus aided, from 1868 to 1871, was \$14,000,000, exclusive of the value of the roads, which is four millions more than the whole indorsement made or promised to railroads which were commenced and entitled to aid on December 2, 1871. It is evident from the low valuation of property at that time that the benefits had but begun, and that a correct statement at this time would show still more marked advantages.

RAILROAD PROPERTY VALUABLE.

To show that railroads are not dead property in Georgia it may be stated that the State owns the Western Atlantic road, which was valued before the war at \$7,000,000, and paid an annual net income to the State of \$450,000. It is now leased for twenty years at the rate of \$25,000 per month, or an aggregate of \$300,000 a year.

GOVERNOR BULLOCK'S ADMINISTRATION.

Governor Conley, in his message of January 11, 1872, says of Governor Bullock's administration:

"Your honorable body will see that the only kind of bonds issued by him that are now outstanding, and that are a claim against the State, are the \$3,000,000 of gold bonds issued under authority of the act of September 15, 1870, and \$1,800,000 of gold bonds issued to the Brunswick and Albany Railroad Company in accordance with the act of October 17, 1870. The actual liability of the State, therefore, incurred during his administration is represented by the sum of \$4,800,000. It should not be forgotten that a large portion of this sum has been devoted to the redemption of bonds falling due in 1870 and 1871, and in years previous thereto, and to the payment of interest on them and others still to fall due. The debt of the State is not, therefore, actually increased by that amount. The contingent liability by the indorsement of railroad bonds during the administration of Governor Bullock amounted to \$6,683,400.

"The above statement covers the whole period that my predecessor was in office, and is a complete and accurate summary of his official action in the matter of which it treats."

The rate of general tax for State purposes under Republican rule was forty cents on \$100. The average cost of the State Government for 1868, 1869, 1870, and 1871, was \$1,334,915 84, including payments on public

debt. The actual public debt of the State was not increased a single dollar under Republican government.

DEMOCRATIC DEFALCATION.

The largest defalcation of a public officer in the South since the war occurred in Georgia in 1875, when it was discovered that the Democratic State Treasurer was a defaulter to upwards of three hundred thousand dollars.

VIRGINIA.

The "Old Dominion" has enjoyed uninterrupted Democratic control since the time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. Whatever her financial condition the Democratic party alone is responsible for it. No "carpet-bagger" has been there to be charged with plundering her people and running the State into debt.

The official reports show the financial condition to be as follows:

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| 1860—State debt..... | \$31,938,114 |
| 1865—Old State debt..... | 41,061,316 |
| Rebel debt..... | 7,505,724 |
| Total..... | 48,567,040 |
| Increase of old debt... | 9,123,172 |
| Total increase..... | 16,628,896 |
| 1870—Old debt..... | 45,872,778 |
| (Rebel debt repudiated.) | |
| Increase of old debt since | |
| 1865..... | 4,811,462 |
| Increase from 1860..... | 13,934,634 |
| 1875—Old debt..... | 44,735,796 |

The debt of Virginia was contracted before the war in aid of internal improvement, and the increase is from interest accruing during and since the war, which has been funded in six per cent. bonds.

The literary fund, amounting to \$1,833,420, which the State held in trust, and \$12,452,326 in bank, and other productive stock, was squandered in the rebellion.

The expenditures of the State for the fiscal year ending October 1, 1875, were \$2,814,614.32.

TAXATION.

Taxes are assessed as follows:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Capitation tax, (\$1.00 each).... | \$264,206 |
| Tax on personal property..... | 357,301 |
| Tax on income..... | 44,014 |
| Tax on real estate..... | 1,281,106 |
| Tax on licenses..... | 519,302 |

Total tax..... 2,465,930

The tax on real and personal property is at the rate of 50 cents on the \$100 value.

The county and township taxes, assessed for the same period as above, amounted to \$1,778,602, which, added to the State tax, gives an aggregate of \$4,244,532.

UNDER WHICH KING, BEZONIAN? SPEAK, OR DIE!

For a moment as it were, after the guns of Sumter awoke the echoes, the nation stood silent, as if appalled by the magnitude of the crime. But for an instant; that moment past, such a tidal wave of wrath and indignation swept from the Atlantic to the Pacific as the world had never seen! Each State poured forth its bravest and best. From the plowshare and the counting house, the study, the surgery, and the court-room, they came, at the call of their country's need.

There was a young lawyer in Cincinnati at that time who had just made a name for himself in the profession he had chosen, winning golden opinions from all sorts of people. He was of Scottish blood, and it is said came of a race of fighting men; for one of his remote ancestors at Lancarty, in Perthshire, drove back the English in a narrow pass, unaided save by his valorous sons. "Pull your plow and harrow to pieces and fight," he cried, and they obeyed him. So at his country's call away went briefs and law-books, and with Rosecrans and Scammon, Lytle and Garfield, Pope and Force, and all the thousand others whom Ohio dedicated to her country's cause—Rutherford B. Hayes rode forth to war. As W. H. Lytle, one of Ohio's most brilliant sons, sung, and proved that his words were more than poet's rhyming—so did Hayes indorse him:

'Tis not the time for dalliance soft
In gentle ladies' bowers,
While treason flaunts her flag aloft
And dares to tread on ours;
And now the swords our fathers wore,
Must in their scabbards rattle,
And we will sing the songs of yore
When marching forth to battle.

Through all the trying campaign in West Virginia, while Rosecrans fought like Napoleon, and McClellan wrote like him, Major Hayes served well and bravely. With his poet brother in-arms, Lytle, he was wounded at South Mountain, (and again in almost every engagement,) but though wounded still struggled to encourage his men, and fell twice from loss of blood before he was carried from the field. He was made Judge Advocate by Rosecrans, and while yet a colonel, again like Lytle, assigned to a brigade command. His commission as brigadier general was not announced until October, 1864, after he had borne the burden and heat of the day, and the war was almost over. In March, 1865, the brevet of major general followed.

Not once through the war did he falter; Lytle was dead at Chickamauga, and Rosecrans relieved ere he could justify himself, and Force wounded almost unto death, and Pope fighting against traitors in front and rear

at the gates of the capital, and Grant just beginning to show what manner of man he was; the days looked very dark, and some wiseacres away up in Chicago voted the war a failure; and the people began to weary—it took so long to make the rebels understand that they *should not* succeed, and lukewarm friends abroad, or those who openly sympathized with the South, predicted that the North would yield, and altogether even the bravest heart quailed under the sombre dread and threatening of evil. But Hayes fought on, and when his friends sent him word that he was nominated for Congress, and had better come home and use his personal efforts toward the election, his reply was, "Your suggestion about getting a furlough to take the stump was certainly made without reflection. AN OFFICER FIT FOR DUTY WHO AT THIS CRISIS WOULD ABANDON HIS POST TO ELECTIONEER FOR A SEAT IN CONGRESS OUGHT TO BE SCALPED." So he was elected without any personal efforts, save his record in the field, and the next year, when the war was over, took his seat in Congress. While a member of that body his acts were in full harmony with the principles which led him to draw his sword. Uncompromisingly loyal, he gave in to no measure which would allow a loophole of help or comfort to the rebels. His one idea there in the halls of the Nation's Capitol was the same as on the fields of that Nation's battles—to save the country.

And now that country, after rewarding one brave soldier with its civic crown, offers it to this one of whom we write. Rutherford B. Hayes is the nominee of the loyal people for the Presidency. Does he deserve the prize? Is there one who fought with him or under the same flag will say "No?" Is there a spot upon his shield? Did he ever turn his back upon the foe in war or upon his principles in peace? Proudly can we answer, Never!

Thrice has his own State, the third in the Union, awarded him with the highest gift within its power, and three times has he proved himself most worthy of the trust implied by the choice. He took no advantage of his high office for self aggrandisement; and when his uncle, a wealthy man, was dying, it was by Major Hayes' own advice and desire, that instead of leaving him his whole fortune he should endow the town of Fremont with \$75,000 for a public park and free library. Wealthy, yet living a quiet, unostentatious, domestic, homely life, he has come forth from his retirement only at the call of duty and at the urgent solicitations of his friends; and when the enthusiasm of the country seemed to point to James G.

Blaine as their standard bearer, and the votes at the convention ran so high for him, few dreamed that the quiet gentleman and student would be the final choice.

So, after the study of his life, we must say the choice was a wise one; although at first there was a feeling of disappointment, because the nominee had not, it seemed, the personal magnetism of James G. Blaine; he had not his flowing and ready eloquence, though when necessary to speak his words were to the point; he had not served so long in Congress; in a word, he had not Blaine's *prestige*; and many thought that, while Blaine would have carried everything before him, Hayes would win, *if he did win*, only by hard fighting. But such sentiments were owing to the first shock of surprise; they have passed away, and for many reasons the people are becoming more and more satisfied with their candidate. His record is unspotted. As a student he stands high, as a lawyer his rank was first, and as a soldier he was brave and intrepid. Four times his horse was shot under him; four times was he wounded; and yet he fought when down until carried from the field. Could a courage more lofty be found among men? There is not a crack in his armor; there is not a spot upon his shield. So far in the canvass there has not been a word about his personal or moral status that would bring a blush to the cheek of his wife or children. The Democratic papers are taking credit to themselves for this abstaining, and calling upon the Republicans to do likewise with their candidate. They should be honest at least once, and acknowledge that they do not abuse or expose Governor Hayes—simply because they can't!

The man stands so gloriously above the touch of malice that they know they cannot harm him! But, poor Tilden! ah! "Look upon that picture and then upon this!" What do we see here?

When every loyal heart was glowing with patriotic fire at the cry that came up from Sumter what did Samuel J. Tilden do? Did he, too, throw away his law books and briefs and go forth with the gallant sons of the Empire State to fight for honor and the right? Did he freely offer his own life that his country might live? No! alas, no! There was no responsive fire in his heart. All was cold, calculating, false!

On April 20, 1861, in reply to President Lincoln's proclamation calling for 75,000 troops, a grand meeting of the citizens of New York was held in Union Square to indorse that action and to pledge themselves to the maintenance of the laws and the Constitution of the United States. General Dix was chosen president, and among the vice presidents or speakers were the names of such Democrats as Daniel S. Dickinson, J. T.

Hoffman, Fernando Wood, A. S. Hewitt, Erastus Brooks, Augustus Schell, and others. Was that of Tilden included? No. One of his friends called upon him and begged him to come, but Tilden refused decidedly to have anything to do with this "abolition war." And when his friend expressed a fear that he would live to regret this refusal, Tilden, having faith that Robert Toombs would yet call his slave-roll at the foot of Bunker Hill, replied: "I think not," and remained firm in his refusal. Nor did he confine himself to negative support of the rebellion; he gave it in words when among his friends. But even before the war broke out, in 1860, he wrote as follows, speaking of the Republican party:

"It is an organized agitation on the general question of slavery, mainly irrespective of the practical application of its conclusions to any proposed measure of legislation or administration of the Federal Government. It is not easy to define the exact limit where the liberty of philosophical speculation or abstract discussion ends and an offense against good neighborhood, whether of individual families or States, begins. But it is very clear that the Republican party has passed that boundary; for an organized agitation by a majority of one community, including its government, against the social or industrial system of a neighboring and friendly community is an offense which leads to alienation and hostility, if not actual war.

* * * * *

"Elect Lincoln and we invite those perils which we cannot measure. We attempt in vain to conquer the submission of the South to an impracticable and intolerable policy. Our only hope must be that as President he will abandon the creed, the principles, and pledges in which he will have been elected. *Defeat Lincoln and all our great interests and hopes are equally safe.*"

The italics are our own. After those words it is useless for Tilden to say he never was a secessionist, and it would be worse than folly to trust such a man with the helm of state.

Mr. Tilden refused to honor with his presence the ratification meeting of loyal men in Union Square, but when a choice coterie of rebel sympathizers and peace Democrats issued a call for a meeting at Delmonico's for the specious purpose of "obtaining a better diffusion of political knowledge," Mr. Tilden's name was appended to the paper without hesitation. At this meeting Mr. Tilden was on the committee on finance. They proposed to raise \$10,000 to carry the election in New Hampshire, and those present contributed largely to that object.

The *Evening Post*, when the report of the meeting was published, had an excellent article upon it. "The conspirators," it said,

"mean to do anything and everything," so one of their speakers said, "to break down the loyal party of the nation, and to hand the Government over to the malignant slaveholding oligarchs who for nearly two years have been slaughtering our sons, disturbing our peace, arresting our prosperity, and threatening the very security of our homes." This brought an answer from Mr. Tilden denying that the meeting at Delmonico's was a "revolutionary intrigue." But, put as bold a face upon the matter as they could, the publication of the doings of the conclave fell like a bombshell among the conspirators. They had been so careful in admitting only such newspaper men as they thought would give a proper coloring to their reports. Mr. Tilden never dreamed that his treason would be given to the world, and he hastened, in a letter, specious in its arguments and covert treason, insulting in its contemptuous allusions to Mr. Lincoln, to cover over the mistake.

Satisfied with what he had done, or fearful of going further while the North was so antagonistic to his peculiar ideas, Mr. Tilden made no further public effort to aid and abet the rebellion until 1864, when, at the great Chicago Convention, he was responsible for the infamous resolutions which voted the war a failure. He made the motion for the forming of the resolutions, and was chairman of the committee which formed them. The second one was as follows:

"Resolved, That this convention does explicitly declare, as the sense of the American people, that after four years of failure to restore the Union by experiment of war, during which, under the pretense of a military necessity, or war power higher than the Constitution, the Constitution itself has been disregarded in every part, and public liberty and private right alike trodden down, and the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired, justice, humanity, liberty, and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for the cessation of hostilities, with a view to an ultimate convention of the States, or other peaceable means, to the end that, at the earliest practicable moment, peace may be restored on the basis of the Federal Union."

This is the sum of his war record: In 1860 his Cahoun letter, (which we have quoted here in part, as it would take up too much space in full, but it breathes comfort and encouragement to the men then taking the final steps to encompass their treason;) his refusal in 1861 to attend a Union meeting in New York city; his peace conspiracy in 1863, and last, but not least, this infamous Chicago compromise resolution. His treason was short-sighted, for if he and his friends had succeeded he could never have attained

his present position. There would have been no United States, and, consequently, no Presidency for ex-rebels and traitors to aspire to. Never by word or act did he encourage a Union soldier or advise a man to serve his country in that capacity. Need we go on? Or is the picture not black enough, confined as it is to an epoch of four years, without painting in the record of the next ten? For that record will show this man in league with thieves and all dishonor. "'Tis true; 'tis pity; and pity 'tis 'tis true."

Yes, although like his rival, clothed with the executive of his native State, we find him using that power only to abuse it; and he comes down from the gubernatorial chair with hands so soiled no honest man would care to touch them!

These are the two men between which the country must choose its leader. Which will it be? One comes to us with the record of bravery undoubted, patriotism of the staunchest, honesty the noblest. His good name is a mirror upon which there is not the shadow of a breath to dim its lustre. The other, while there are some "so poor as to do him honor," they are only among those of his own kind, men who strove to destroy the country, or to plunder their fellow-beings in the most barefaced robbery ever known since the days of highwaymen, whose challenge was, "your money or your life!"

One accepts the offered honor in a manly letter, a good exponent of his character, written by himself, and prompted only by his own probity. The other, with a flourish of trumpets about "retrenchment" and "reform," foists upon the people a tirade dictated by the bitterest enemies of the country's interests, and worded carefully to dovetail into the principles of the dastardly party which would have destroyed that country in the past, and will destroy it in the future if it gain sway.

People of the United States, choose ye between them!

VERMONT has spoken! Already her voice, renewing her pledge to the Union and its defenders, has been heard throughout the length and breadth of the land. Its emphatic tones will reassure freemen everywhere that human rights are not to be betrayed nor the cause for which so many died surrendered to the enemies of liberty. Thirty thousand majority for the Republican ticket in Vermont means a united North in November. Now let the ranks close up for other work to be done. Two months of active labor is still before us. Let the example set by the Green Mountain boys inspire the nation to labor for a victory whose meaning shall be the extinction of Democracy.

REVIEW OF THE MONTH.

DECEASED.

...August 18. Hon. M. C. Kerr, Speaker of the House of Representatives, died at Rock Alum Springs, Va. Mr. Kerr was born at Titusville, Pennsylvania, March 15, 1827. In 1851 he graduated at the Titusville University, since which time he resided at New Albany, Indiana, where he began the practice of law in 1852. Subsequently he was elected to several offices in the State, and from 1864 to 1876 he was continuously a Representative in Congress, except during the years 1873 and 1874. In politics Mr. Kerr was a Democrat, but of such pure, unselfish, and patriotic character as always to deserve the esteem and confidence of his political opponents. He was elected Speaker of the Forty-fourth Congress. His remains were conveyed to New Albany to be buried in the city cemetery.

POLITICAL.

...August 23. The Republican convention of the State of New York assembled at Albany for the purpose of nominating a State ticket. Ex-Governor E. D. Morgan, well known as the great war Governor of the Empire State, and compatriot of Lincoln, Morton, and Andrews, was chosen for Governor with the cordial unanimity of the convention. Hon. William M. Evarts was the next strongest candidate and received 126 votes on the first ballot, to 242 for Morgan.

...August 24. The Republicans of Colorado placed the following ticket in nomination: For Governor, John L. Routt; for Lieutenant Governor, Lafayette Head; for Judges of the Supreme Court, H. C. Thatcher, E. T. Wells, and S. H. Elbert; for Secretary of State, Wm. L. Clark; for Treasurer, Geo. C. Corning; for Auditor, D. C. Crawford; for Attorney General, A. J. Sampson; for Superintendent of Public Instruction, J. C. Halleck.

...August 24. The Democrats of Kansas assembled at Topeka, and nominated a State ticket as follows: For Governor, John Marlin; Lieutenant Governor, B. Rogers; Treasurer, M. C. South. A compromise was effected with the greenback party whereby three of its candidates for State officers were adopted by the Democrats.

August 30. The Republican State convention of Connecticut nominated the following electoral ticket at large: Ex-President Theo. D. Woolsey, of Yale College, and Hon. Marshall Jewell. The old ticket was renominated as follows: Governor, Henry C. Robinson, Hartford; Lieutenant Governor, F. J. Kingsbury, Waterbury; Secretary of State, General F. A. Walker, New Haven; Treas-

urer, Jeremiah Olney, Thompson; Comptroller, Eli Curtis, Watertown.

GOVERNOR SEYMOUR NOMINATED.

...August 39. The Democratic State convention of New York met at Saratoga and nominated Hon. Horatio Seymour for Governor by acclamation, notwithstanding his repeated protests against becoming a candidate. Strong efforts followed to induce Mr. Seymour to accept the nomination, but he positively refused the proffered honor, and on the 4th of September wrote a lengthy letter of unqualified declination. His chief reason for this course he states as follows: "My own opinion, confirmed by the judgment of my physicians, convince me that I am unable at this time to perform the duties devolving upon the Governor of New York. I could cheerfully sacrifice my own purposes and feelings to meet the wishes of my friends. I would not hesitate to peril my health to uphold those principles in which I believe, or to promote the public welfare, but I feel that I should sacrifice the interests of the party which placed me in nomination if I accept its action. Even the superior strength of the party with which I act could not elect a ticket with the known fact that its nominee for Governor was unequal to the performance of the labors of that office. I could not conscientiously enter upon them. I cannot do my friends the wrong of placing them in false positions by trying to do so. I therefore feel compelled to decline the nomination."

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S CIRCULAR.

...September 4. The official instructions this day issued by Attorney-General Taft to United States marshals in the late insurrectionary States constitute a most important and significant State paper. The absolute necessity of inaugurating active measures to protect the lives and the rights of citizens at home happily is at last receiving the earnest attention of the Government. The fact has been notorious for several years past that Republican citizens in the South have been repeatedly outraged in their most sacred rights by enemies of the Government, and so frequent and alarming has this practice become within the past twelve months that it threatens to overthrow republican institutions in that lawless section unless some effective measures be employed to put a check to the growing evil. Already there is utter disregard of the rights of the majority, which is Republican, in the States of South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Were there a fair and free canvass and election the first two States would cast their electoral votes for the Republican nominee for the

Presidency by at least *forty thousand* majority each, while Louisiana would give a Republican majority of not less than twenty thousand. But, owing to the high-handed and revolutionary policy of the enemies of Republicanism and the nation, and the success with which they have met in past elections by the non-action of the Government; they now boldly threaten to sweep these States into the Democratic ranks by sheer force, if necessary, and, notwithstanding their well known Republican majorities, count their electoral votes for the Democratic nominees.

It is to defeat this daring and wicked crusade against the political rights of unprotected and helpless citizens that the Attorney General has issued the instructions referred to, and he deserves to be approved and applauded by every well-meaning citizen for the timely and patriotic act. The issue as made up by the enemy is easily defined. They mean the total destruction and obliteration of every semblance of Republicanism in the South. This design being openly and defiantly avowed, the Government would be recreant to its most sacred trust if it did not adopt resolute means to defend its character, protect its citizens in their guaranteed rights, and to suppress this new rebellion against its principles and authority.

...September 4. The Republican State convention of Massachusetts assembled, and re-nominated Hon. Alexander H. Rice for Governor, and Horatio G. Knight for Lieutenant Governor.

...September 4. An election for State officers was held in Arkansas, and the Democratic ticket prevailed by a majority estimated at 30,000. The State is overwhelmingly Democratic.

...September 5. An election occurred in the State of Vermont, and was carried by the Republicans by a majority of about 26,000, the largest majority given at a State election in many years. The following ticket was elected: Governor, Horace Fairbanks; Lieutenant Governor, Redfield Proctor; Treasurer, John A. Page. Also three Republican Congressmen were chosen, as follows: First district, Charles H. Joyce; Second district, Dudley C. Dennison; Third district, George W. Hendee.

A summary of the vote of the State in past years is given below:

| | Rep. | Dem. | Rep. maj |
|----------------------|--------|--------|----------|
| 1878..President..... | 44,197 | 12,945 | 32,122 |
| 1879..Governor..... | 33,367 | 12,058 | 21,309 |
| 1879..Congress..... | 30,071 | 11,478 | 18,593 |
| 1872..President..... | 41,481 | 11,480 | 30,001 |
| 1872..Governor..... | 41,946 | 16,613 | 25,333 |
| 1872..Congress..... | 37,504 | 12,672 | 24,832 |
| 1874..Governor..... | 35,482 | 13,257 | 20,225 |
| 1874..Congress..... | 24,437 | 16,220 | 8,217 |

...September 6. The Democratic State convention of Massachusetts met and nominated Hon. Charles Francis Adams for Governor, and William P. Plunkett for Lieutenant Governor.

...September 6. Hon. Paren England was chosen for Governor of Nebraska by the Democrats.

EXECUTIVE AND DEPARTMENT DOINGS.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

REDEMPTION OF FIVE-TWENTY BONDS.

The thirty-second call for the redemption of five-twenty bonds of 1865—May and November—has just been issued by Acting Secretary Conant, who gives notice that the principal and accrued interest of the bonds herein below designated, known as "five-twenty bonds," will be paid at the Treasury of the United States, in this city, on and after the first day of December, 1876, and that the interest on said bonds will cease on that day. That is to say, coupon bonds, net of March 3, 1865, dated November 1, 1865, as follows: Coupon bonds—\$500, No. 501 to No. 3350, both inclusive; \$1,000, No. 2801 to No. 14550, both inclusive—\$7,000,000. Registered bonds—\$100, No. 1 to No. 200, both inclusive; \$500, No. 1 to No. 800, both inclusive; \$1,000, No. 1 to No. 500, both inclusive; \$5,000, No. 642 to No. 1100, both inclusive; \$10,000, No. 1 to No. 1150, both inclusive. Total, \$10,000,000.

ANOTHER CALL.

By virtue of the authority given by the act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, the Acting Secretary of the Treasury gives notice that the principal and accrued interest of the bonds herein below designated, known as "five-twenty bonds," of the act of March 3, 1865, dated November 1, 1865, will be paid at the Treasury on and after the 6th day of December, 1876, and that the interest on said bonds will cease on that day: Coupon bonds—\$50, No. 551 to No. 600, both inclusive; \$100, No. 851 to No. 2500, both inclusive; \$500, No. 3351, to No. 9700, both inclusive; \$1,000, No. 14551 to No. 26000, both inclusive—total coupon, \$7,000,000. Registered bonds—\$100, No. 201 to No. 650, both inclusive; \$500, No. 801 to No. 1050, both inclusive; \$1,000, No. 501 to No. 1800, both inclusive; \$5,000, No. 1101 to No. 1550, both inclusive; \$10,000, No. 1151 to No. 2100, both inclusive—total registered, \$3,000,000. Aggregate, \$10,000,000.

COINAGE AT THE MINT.

The following is the statement of the coinage executed at the United States mint in Philadelphia for the month of August:

| Denomination. | No. of pieces. | Value. |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Double eagles..... | 18 489 | \$369,600 |
| Trade dollars..... | 84,200 | 84,200 |
| Half dollars..... | 1,404,200 | 702,100 |
| Quarter dollars..... | 1,292,200 | 323,050 |
| Twenty cents..... | 200 | 40 |
| Dimes..... | 910,200 | 91,020 |
| Total silver..... | 3,691,000 | 1,200,410 |
| Five cents..... | 310,000 | 15,500 |
| Cents..... | 220,000 | 2 200 |
| Total base..... | 530,000 | 17,700 |
| Total for month..... | 4,239,480 | 1,587,710 |

PUBLIC DEBT STATEMENT.

The recapitulation of the statement of the public debt of the United States for the month of August, 1876, just issued, is as follows:

DEBT BEARING INTEREST IN COIN.

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Bonds at 6 per cent..... | \$984,000,050 00 |
| Bonds at 5 per cent..... | 712,320,450 00 |
| | 1,697,320,500 00 |

DEBT BEARING INTEREST IN LAWFUL MONEY.

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Navy pension fund at three per cent..... | 14,000,000 00 |
| Debt on which interest has ceased since maturity..... | 3,021,210 26 |

DEBT BEARING NO INTEREST.

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Old demand and legal-tender notes..... | 369,401,335 50 |
| Certificates of deposit..... | 31,880,000 00 |
| Fractional currency..... | 31,355,311 45 |
| Coin certificates..... | 29,969,800 00 |
| | 462,605,44 95 |

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Total debt..... | 2,176,947,758 21 |
| Interest..... | 24,292,945 91 |
| Total debt, principal and interest..... | 2,501,240,705 17 |

CASH IN THE TREASURY.

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Coin..... | 62,511,956 17 |
| Currency..... | 11,665,805 86 |
| Special deposit held for redemption of certificates of deposit as provided by law..... | 31,880,000 00 |
| Total..... | 105,058,762 03 |
| Debt, less cash in the Treasury September 1, 1876..... | 2,095,181,941 14 |
| Debt, less cash in the Treasury, August 1, 1876..... | 2,098,391,311 06 |
| Decrease of debt during the month..... | 3,109,369 92 |
| Decrease of debt since June 30, 1876..... | 4,257,403 85 |

Bonds issued to the Pacific railway companies, interest payable in lawful money:

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Principal outstanding..... | \$64,623,512 00 |
| Interest accrued and not yet paid..... | 643,235 12 |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Interest paid by the United States..... | 32,080,218 42 |
| Interest repaid by transportation of mails, &c..... | 6,924,552 38 |

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Balance of interest paid by the United States..... | \$25,155,663 04 |
|--|-----------------|

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

CIRCULAR OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

On September 4th the Attorney General issued the following circular instructing marshals as to their duties in connection with the protection of voters:

SIR: The laws of the United States having made it my duty to exercise general direction over marshals in the manner of discharging their offices, I have prepared for their use this circular letter of instructions as to the coming elections—intending the same also as a reply once for all to numerous applications, in like connection, from private citizens in various States.

In the present condition of legislation the United States occupy a position toward voters and voting which varies according as the election is for State and other local officers only, or for members of Congress and Presidential electors.

In elections at which members of the House of Representatives are chosen, which by law include also elections at which the electors for President and Vice President are appointed, the United States secure voters against whatever in general hinders or prevents them from a free exercise of the elective franchise—extending that care alike to the registration lists, the act of voting, and the personal freedom and security of the voter at all times, as well against violence on account of any vote that he may intend to give, as against conspiracy because of any that he may already have given.

The peace of the United States, therefore, which you are to preserve, and whose violation you are to suppress, protects (among others) the rights specified in the last paragraph, and any person who by force violates those rights breaks that peace and renders it your duty to arrest him, and to suppress any riots incident, or that threaten the integrity of the registration or election, to the end that the will of the people in such election may be ascertained and take effect, and that offenders may be brought before the court for punishment.

Notorious events in several States, which recently and in an unusual manner have been publicly reprobated, render it a grave duty of all marshals who have cause to apprehend a violation of the peace of the United States connected as above with the elec-

tions to be held upon the Tuesday after the first Monday in November next to be prepared to preserve and to restore such peace.

As the chief executive officer of the United States in your district you will be held responsible for all breaches of the peace of the United States which diligence on your part might have prevented, and for the arrest and securing of all persons who violate that peace in any of the points above enumerated.

Diligence in these matters requires, of course, that you be, and continue, present, in person or by deputy, at all places of registration or election at which you have reason to suspect that the peace is threatened; and that whenever an embodiment of the *posse comitatus* is required to enforce the law such embodiment be effected.

You will observe that the "special" deputies mentioned in section 2021 of the Revised Statutes have peculiar duties assigned to them, duties which otherwise do not belong to deputy marshals. Such "special" deputies can be appointed only in cities of twenty thousand inhabitants or upward.

But the duties assigned to marshals and their deputies by section 2022, or other like statutes, belong to all duly appointed deputies, whether they be general or be "special," within the meaning of that and the preceding section. Deputies to discharge this latter class of duties may be appointed to any number whatever, according to the discretion of the marshal, in all States in which sheriffs have a similar power. Section 2030 has no practical bearing upon this point in States where no limit is imposed upon the appointment of deputies by sheriffs, because in such States the laws of the United States "prior to the 10th of June, 1872," left marshals also unlimited as to the number of their deputies.

In discharging the duties above mentioned you will doubtless receive the countenance and support of all the good citizens of the United States in your respective districts. It is not necessary that it is upon such countenance and support that the United States mainly rely in their endeavor to enforce the right to vote which they have given or have secured. The present instructions are intended only to counteract that partial malice, wrong-headedness, or inconsideration which sometimes triumphs at critical moments over the conservative and in general prevailing forces of society, and to which the present and passing condition of the country gives more than ordinary strength, and, therefore, requires the Government to particularly to observe and provide against.

In this connection I advise that you and each of your deputies, general and "special," have a right to summon to your assistance, in preventing and quelling disorder, "every person in the district above fifteen years of

age, whatever may be their occupation, whether civilians or not, and including the military of all denominations—militia, soldiers, marines—all of whom are alike bound to obey you. The fact that they are organized as military bodies—whether of the State or the United States—under the immediate command of their own officers, does not in any wise affect their legal character. They are the *posse comitatus*." I prefer to quote the above statement of the law upon this point from an opinion by my predecessor, Attorney General Cushing, because it thus appears to have been well settled for many years.—(6, Opinions, 466, May 27, 1854.)

I need hardly add that there can be no State law or State official in this country who has jurisdiction to oppose you in discharging your official duties under the laws of the United States. If such interference shall take place—a thing not anticipated—you are to disregard it entirely. The laws of the United States are supreme, and so, consequently, is the action of officials of the United States in enforcing them. There is, as virtually you have already been told, no officer of a State whom you may not by summons embody into your own *posse* and any State *posse* already embodied by a sheriff will, with such sheriff, be obliged, upon your summons, to become a part of a United States *posse*, and obey you or your deputy acting *virtute officii*.

The responsibility which devolves upon an officer clothed with such powers, and required to guard the highest right of citizens, corresponds in degree with those powers and rights, and exacts of such officer consideration, intelligence, and courage.

It is proper to advise you that in preparing this circular I have considered recent important judgments given by the Supreme Court of the United States upon the acts of Congress which regulate this general topic.

I have founded the above instructions upon those acts as affected by such judgments, and I need in this place add no more than that these judgments do not concern elections for Federal offices.

You will find appended, in full or by reference, such statutory provisions as it seems important that you and your deputies shall in this connection read and consider.

In matters of doubt you are of course entitled to the advice of the United States attorney for your district.

These instructions have been submitted to the President, and have his approval.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

ALPHONSO TAFT,

Attorney General.

A copy of this was referred by the Secretary of War to General Sherman for his information and guidance.